NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. DXXXIX.

OCTOBER, 1901.

CONGRESS AND ANARCHY: A SUGGESTION.

BY S. C. T. DODD, GENERAL SOLICITOR OF THE STANDARD OIL CO.

THE desirability of securing uniformity throughout the Union in the laws regulating trade, commerce, marriage and divorce, citizenship, and the treatment of such diseases as insanity and phthisis has been increasingly apparent in recent years. Some progress has been made in this direction. In many of the States practically uniform enactments have been made as to rules affecting commercial paper, and, since the recent cases of kidnapping, numerous measures of severity have been introduced into the legislatures of Iowa, Wisconsin, South Dakota, North Dakota and Wyoming, as well as of some Eastern States.

Uniformity of State legislation can only be obtained by the legislatures of all the States passing and their Governors signing laws which shall be essentially identical. That this should be done so far as concerns the regulation of marriage and divorce, insanity, the conditions of State citizenship, arrest of the person and attachment of property, the qualifications for the right to practice certain professions, the crime of kidnapping, and perhaps the use of hypnotism and the custody and treatment of the sufferers from phthisis, many authorities agree. Under the Constitution of the United States these subjects can be dealt with only by the sovereign States.

Copyright, 1901, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So far, experience has shown it to be so difficult as to be almost impossible to bring about the passage of uniform State laws.

It is true that a German Code of Commerce, drawn under a resolution of the Frankfort Diet, some years ago, was enacted into law by the legislative bodies of the practically independent German states. This, it has been argued, shows that communities connected by bonds of trade, and of a common race and speech, can be bound still more closely by common laws.

It is also true that the States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Delaware, New Jersey, Georgia and New York have appointed Commissioners, from year to year in the past decade, to devise a plan for securing uniform State legislation, and that these Commissioners have had a number of meetings, at some of which as many as thirty-one States have been represented.

But no uniform law has yet been enacted.

There are "many men of many minds" in each of the two bodies which constitute each State legislature; and there are forty-six States.

How mighty must be the impulse, and how far reaching, that will impress with a common purpose and a common zeal the majority in each of these double legislatures!

The universal detestation felt for the crimes of anarchy might suffice to ensure this result. Had every State legislature been in session when the attempt was made on the life of President McKinley, in Buffalo, had practiced hands prepared immediately and presented to all the legislatures a uniform enactment against anarchistic incitement to crime, against attempts at violence in pursuance of such incitement, as well as against the overt act of assassination itself, then in the heat of popular indignation all the legislatures might have passed and all the Governors signed such a bill. And yet had laws been passed under the hurried pressure of such excitement, the courts called upon to construe them would probably have found them contravening that provision of our Constitution which permits a freedom of speech by many believed to be dangerous.

The difficulty of securing uniform State legislation upon any subject leads many to advocate such amendments of the Federal Constitution as will enable Congress to legislate upon many subjects now forbidden to it. But to secure an amendment to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Constitution enlarging the powers of Congress will be found as difficult, I may almost say as impossible, as to secure uniform State laws. In order to become an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, a measure must be proposed by both Houses of Congress by a two-thirds majority, or by a convention called on application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States, and after being so proposed must be introduced into the legislatures of all the States and be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States. Considering the views of the people of at least one-third of the States upon the question of State sovereignty, it is doubtful whether the Constitution will ever again be amended so as to increase Federal power.

It has been suggested that attempts upon the life of the President and other high officials be made treason. This would be impossible without an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which defines treason to consist only in levying war upon the United States or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

Neither can freedom of speech nor of the press be abridged without an amendment to the Constitution.

It is fortunately not necessary to wait for uniform State legislation nor an amendment of the Federal Constitution in order to take steps which might prove efficacious against the hideous crime of anarchy.

There is in the Government of the United States an inherent power to deal practically with anarchists.

This power is clear when anarchists assault or threaten to assault officials of the Government in the discharge of the official duties.

"It is inherent in the executive department of any Government to protect itself" (L. R. A., vol. 5., p. 91). It is the duty of the President, under Article II., Section 3, of the Constitution, to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed," wherever he may be. It was said that "the Chambers of the Judge are wherever he happens to be in his Circuit" (in re Neagle), in which case the United States Circuit Court in California held United States Marshal Neagle not answerable to the State tribunals, and to have been acting only in accordance with his duty as a Federal peace officer, when, on August 14, 1889, he shot and killed Judge Terry as the latter was in the act of assaulting Justice Stephen Field.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The President's obligation to "take care that the laws be faithfully executed" rests on him wherever he is in the United States. The inherent power of the Government to protect his person seems to follow him.

In *Ex Parte Siebold* the Supreme Court of the United States declared:

"We hold it to be an incontrovertible principle that the Government of the United States may, by means of physical force, exercised through its official agents, execute on every foot of American soil the powers and functions that belong to it." Is not the power of self-protection the chief of these?

If the power of appointment of United States peace officers to guard the President should be held not clear under existing statutes, "Congress has power," the Supreme Court of the United States decided in *Ex Parte Royal* (17 U. S., 249) "to pass all laws necessary and proper to carry into execution the powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States."

Congress certainly has power, if severer laws are necessary, to make all attempts upon the life of the President of the United States, or other high officials, including all conspiracies of a like nature, punishable with death. It also has power to prevent the importation into the United States of persons known to hold anarchistic sentiments, whose presence would be dangerous to our peace and security.

The present emergency demands Federal rather than State legislation, and need not await the delay and uncertainty of Constitutional amendment.

S. C. T. Dodd.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ANARCHISTS AND THE PRESIDENT.

BY CHARLES JOHNSTON, BENGAL CIVIL SERVICE (RETIRED).

JUST a year ago, in a study of Nihilism and Anarchy, a comparison was drawn between the great Russian movement of twenty years ago and the present condition of international unrest, with its series of sensational attacks against the rulers of states, whether monarchies or republics. During that brief period of twelve months there have been added to the already long list of homicidal attempts three more crimes against the heads of states: Sipido's shooting at the King of England, the almost maniacal attack on the German Emperor, and, finally, the tragedy at Buffalo—all in line with the previous outbreaks of anarchical passion, which had as their instruments Caserio, Luccheni and Bresci, and as their victims the French President, the Austrian Empress, and the King of Italy. Unhappily, this regular progression in violence is a fulfillment of a prophecy embodied in the essay above mentioned: that, as the causes which engender anarchy were increasing rather than decreasing, no cessation of these wild outbursts was to be expected or could reasonably be hoped for. Recent events show that this is tragically true still; the causes which make for anarchy are waxing rather than waning.

A main difference between the great movement which culminated in the Nihilism of the Russian Terrorists and the present spread of anarchy was then pointed out: the abundance of intellectual force and culture among the Russians—visible not less in the writers of that movement, like Hertzen, Stepniak and Kropotkin, than in the workers, like Bakunin, Vera Zassulich, Sophie Perovskaya, Geliaboff, and so many others—so strongly contrasted with the evident ignorance and intellectual poverty of unfortunates like Bresci, Sipido, Caserio and Luccheni. This difference

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in moral equipment as was natural led to a wide difference in method. The Russian movement was marvelously organized, with a strong central Executive Committee, regular officers, and a system of correspondence and communication almost as complete as the bureaucracy of the Russian government against which it had proclaimed war. The anarchists seem to be without any close affiliation or defined plans, or any clear conceptions for the future beyond their lurid utopian dreams.

In reality this lack of organization, this poverty of intellectual light and leading, makes the working of anarchy very much more formidable. The sporadic occurrence of anarchical passion in so many different lands, under such contrasted forms of governments, points to conditions far more serious and dangerous than the successful propaganda of a few masterful spirits. This movement is not the outcome of the genius of a few Hertzens and Bakunins; it is the tragical harvest of ancient seeds of evil sown long ago in medieval Europe and now coming to life and growth not only in Europe but in America. For those who have eyes to see, and not merely wrath to denounce, these terrible outbreaks are but the visible signs of conditions very widespread, conditions of terrible hardship and oppression, even of grinding, heartbreaking suffering; and it is impossible not to look forward with the gloomiest apprehension to the results of these conditions in the future and even more to the results of the widespread cry for vengeance which the outbreaks of anarchy have evoked.

We gain our first clear insight into the causes of anarchy when we consider the nationality of its militant apostles. Caserio, Luccheni, Bresci, Sipido—all Italians—are but the most desperate and despairing sons of a nation whose peasants have long suffered and at this moment suffer almost measureless deprivations, exactions and oppressions. Writer after writer has described for us with that unanimous testimony which is the voice of truth itself the degradation, spiritual, moral and material, of the Italian peasants and working classes; the wretched hovels they dwell in amid squalor and filth, the foul food which they are driven to as sole means of sustenance, the grinding oppression of the system under which they live, compelled out of the meagre pittance they wring from the overtaxed earth to support two great classes in idleness and luxury—the land owners and the administrators—officeholders multiplied indefinitely, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the salaries they are to receive, not for the services they are to render. Read the horrible pictures of peasant life which d'Annunzio has painted. Compare them with the vignettes of squalid misery occasionally inserted by Marion Crawford among his magnificent portraits of princes and grandees of Quirinal or Vatican, and one is filled with horror and despondency to think that twenty centuries of Christianity in the oldest of Christian countries have done so little to mitigate this boundless suffering; that human beings with hearts and souls like ourselves can be condemned to such seemingly issueless misery. It is the old bad division into masters and serfs continued by evil fate into our modern world of freedom and humane liberty for all; it is the grasping selfishness of those who will not work contriving by a hundred artifices to fix themselves parasite-like on the lives of those who toil. The earth, mother of all and ready to render sustenance to all, is by force of arms monopolized by a few powerful families, who do not till the land themselves and only allow their fellow men to sow and reap on condition of servitude—the payment of never-ceasing tribute—for which nothing is given in return.

Besides this first tribute to the "land owners," there is the second tribute to the administration; and this double levy the Italian peasant, had he the best will in the world, is simply unable to pay, or is able to pay only at the cost of such suffering and hardship as reduce him to the level, or below the level, of a beast of burden. We are accustomed to the spectacle of Italian immigrants, poor, illiterate, unkempt, furtive; we must remember that only the most vigorous emigrate, and from the condition of these we can infer the misery of those who are left behind. Their passionate love of their fair motherland leads many to return; they can do this the more easily because the almost universal poverty around their homes enhances their savings to the position of comparative wealth.

The mention of immigration reminds us that we have here a very delicate barometer of the poverty of European countries, a gauge whereby we can estimate the intensity of the struggle for life in those older lands to which our whole white population may look back as their original homes. Thus the famine in Ireland brought almost two million immigrants from that country within a few years. The increase of commercial competition,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

added to military burdens, then gave the palm to Germany. Now Italy leads, sending nearly a hundred thousand immigrants yearly to our shores. When we think of the long struggle with poverty which must precede the determination of a passionately home-loving people to sell all their possessions and seek refuge across the seas, we have an index of the condition of peasant life in Italy, a window through which we can see at work the forces which engender desperate anarchists like Caserio, Sipido, Bresci and Luccheni.

Next after the Italians the Slavs, including Poles, Bohemians and Slovaks, are the most numerous contingent among our present immigrants. As yet they are only half as numerous as the Italians, but they are already as numerous as the Germans and Irish together—a striking proof of the shifting of storm-pressure in the Old World. From this Slavonic contingent the actors in the Buffalo tragedy seem to have been entirely drawn. Here is a new page in the history of anarchy, very strongly reminiscent of the old Nihilist days. We have the same types of personalities and names—Polish, Slovak, Russian, or Jewish—which Nihilism made us so familiar with; the same super-excited, inflammable temperaments, half-dreamer, half-revolutionary, and the same real misery as the underlying cause and motive-power. For it has become very evident that these masses of Italian and Slavonic immigrants sent forth from their motherlands by the grinding deprivations of their lives have brought with them not only their languages and mental idiosyncrasies, but the whole psychic atmosphere of their homes; so that we have districts of Poland and Bohemia and Italy with all their bitter memories caught up, as it were, and carried bodily through the air to this country. The impress of oppression has worn too deep to be easily cast off, and the difficulty of establishing themselves in a new country is often construed by them as a continuation of the old bad forces which drove them forth from their homes. Therefore, we see that the anarchists of this country, and especially those of the class to which Czolgosz belongs—Slavs, Polish and Russian Jews—are in no sense a product of American conditions, but rather a growth transplanted from the Old World, where they were engendered not through any diabolic malice of their own, but as the result of dreadfully burdensome conditions of life, steadily accumulated and added to since the red days of medieval Europe.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is a startling reminder to us of the endless complexity of life in the United States—this presence among us of numberless miniatures of older European lands, clinging to their own tongues and customs, and still haunted by wraiths and vampires that drove them forth from their homes. The States are, indeed, nothing but such a composite, a congeries of fragments broken from Britain, Germany, Italy, Ireland—every land in the Old World. Bringing with them their contribution of new inhabitants, they have brought with them not less their store of old evils, their scars burned into heart and mind, their old furtive habits of fear and the thirst for vengeance on the oppressor. In two or three generations this inherited virus will wear itself out, and we shall have a new race with new vital forces drawn from our prolific and teeming land, and cherished by the spirit of humane and generous liberty which is the deep inspiration of the New World. The welcome which this country has given to the oppressed of every nation will be amply repaid, and the pressure of example will slowly, but not less surely, lighten the heavy burdens of those who remain behind, unable or unwilling to cross the ocean and seek new homes on virgin soil. We shall not talk in a spirit of silly vanity of beating Europe in competition, but, remembering that one or another part of Europe is the motherland of each and all of us, the home of our fathers for countless generations, we shall view the old lands more generously, and therefore more justly, ready to give rather than to receive, and seeing that true pre-eminence consists in worthy service.

These islands of the Old World, therefore, thus transplanted to our midst, with the murky clouds still hanging about them, are the hotbeds of anarchy in this country, and in every case those among whom the anarchical spirit is strongest are the sons and daughters of races which have most heavily suffered, ground down under injustice and oppression. Poles, robbed of their place and nation, forced to lose their own character and blend themselves with Russians, German or Austrian Teutons and Magyars, have within them the gnawing hunger for national life and the free expression of their peculiar genius; their worm dieth not, and their fire is not quenched; with their strong and excitable imaginations, their vivid fancy and quick, passionate tempers, they are like tinder only waiting for the spark to kindle them to revolt—revolt against the whole world and the system

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which has fallen with such crushing weight upon their own land; or Jews from the ghettos of Eastern Europe, sore with unnumbered slights and degradations, feeling themselves looked down upon and shunned, and feeling, too, within them the rare genius and fire of their most gifted nation, their nervous, over-sensitive natures easily wrought up to frenzy by the memory of old evils or the picture of fancied wrongs; or sons of Italian peasants, looking back to the hovels and squalor they have left behind, and feeling the keen degradation still resting upon their kindred at home—these are the men and women from whom the anarchist centers are recruited, who make up the groups we hear so much of in these days, the anarchist clubs seemingly found in every chief city of the Union.

What, then, is the remedy for all this? Shall it be drawn from the Old Testament or the New? Shall we try once again the bad old law of retaliation—eye for eye and tooth for tooth—formally and categorically repealed in the Sermon on the Mount, or shall we take the better way, the way of generous sympathy, and, seeing the source of anarchy in the boundless oppression and injustice of systems still lingering in the Old World, shall we also see the cure in steady progress in humanity and enlightenment, in mutual understanding and help, in the idea that eminence consists not in wealth but in the service of others—the one and only patent of true nobility?

It is a frightful thing to see such outbreaks of homicidal violence on the part of the poor and unprivileged, the neglected and oppressed of the earth, as we had in the attacks on the French President, the Austrian Empress, the Kings of Italy and England, the Emperor of Germany, and now the President of the United States. But even more shocking, more discreditable to our humanity, more unworthy of our twenty centuries of Christian faith, is the almost universal cry for vengeance, for the infliction of cruel and inhuman penalties on those who perpetrate these crimes, for their extermination, as though they were evil beasts and not immortal souls—blinded and sinning, it is true, but not the less immortal. That outcry is the real anarchy, the real and formidable evil. The failure to see that these unhappy plotters of violence are the victims of evils from which we have happily escaped, the failure to see that it is our duty to help them and the whole class from which they spring—the servile

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class in all European lands, and especially in those lands which have suffered most—the failure to deal generously even in imagination and understanding, if not in act with these unprivileged ones, and the cowardly cry for revenge, for blood, for extermination of these poor creatures—this is true anarchy, and a most formidable menace for the days to come!

It was just this spirit of panic cowardice masquerading as a fine sense of justice which drove the Russian Nihilists into frenzies of crime, into cruel and atrocious retaliations. And we may say, with the certainty of seeing our words made good by facts, that the same fierce and cruel spirit of repression will bring forth the same evil fruit once again, that violence will engender violence, that hate will sow the seeds of hate. Generous human sympathy is the one and only cure for human evil, and no craven fear for our own comfort and well-being should chill our hearts and check that sympathy. Thus only shall we escape the doom pronounced on those who, through vileness, make the great betrayal. If it was the panic fear of the Russian administration which drove the Terrorists to their fiercest excesses, not less was it the serene and quiet courage of Alexander III. that restored health to the body politic of Russia. And so it will be again. Every real and sincere attempt to lighten the burden of those who toil, to see their lives as we see our own, to make allowance and deal generously, is a step toward the eradication of anarchy. Every deed of violence in the outraged name of justice breeds anarchy, and is anarchy itself.

The thought that human wrong can be righted by new wrong, that violence and oppression are cures for social ills, is anarchy itself, whether it be embodied in some hunted fugitive of justice, or in the person of one sworn to administer justice. Hatred ceases not by hatred. Hatred ceases only by love. On whom is it most incumbent to remember this—on the unprivileged alien, son of a race for ages downtrodden and oppressed, or on those who have every gift of prosperity and culture, on whom fortune seems to have poured forth all her treasures? The really gloomy and formidable fact called forth by the recent anarchist outbreaks is not the spread of revolutionary ideas amongst the masses, but the spirit of anarchy amongst those who have every privilege, their appeal to violence as the cure for violence, their cry for vengeance, for cruel and exemplary punishments of those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who already have suffered much. What is the difference in spirit between these three—the anarchist who thinks the dagger and the bullet will right human wrongs, the prosperous person who cries out for vengeance and violent death as the cure for anarchy, and the citizen who takes the law into his own hands and lynches some negro guilty or suspected of assault, torturing him with a fiendish cruelty which no anarchist has ever been guilty of? Is not the same spirit present in all three?

While the horrible anarchy of negro-burning remains as a stain upon the United States we would do well to speak less of anarchists brought here from the older countries across the seas. The methods of these are merciful compared with the fiendish cruelty of the stake thus frightfully revived in our own day, while the claim that the individual may take the law into his hands and inflict the death penalty without the law is

archists of both lyncher and assassin alike. If cruelence be resorted to as the cure for anarchy, we sh of the hoped-for cure a fresh crop of violence an outbreaks more frequent and more widespread, u of true courage and wide vision arises, as Alexanc in Nihilist-haunted Russia—some man who, in a g wise spirit, shall set himself to remedy those ills thi anarchists are bred, and thus with the cause of the d take away the symptoms, bringing peace to the nati himself lasting honor among the great ones of the eart

CHARLES JOI

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PERSONAL LIBERTY AND LABOR STRIKES.

BY THE MOST REVEREND JOHN IRELAND, ARCHBISHOP OF ST. PAUL.

THE most sacred inheritance of the citizen is personal liberty. The right to employ his powers as he wills, to dispose of his affairs as he wills, save only in so far as it is limited by the rights of others, or the welfare of the community—this is nature's gift to man. "All men are born equal." By nature no man is endowed with authority over his fellows; no man is warranted in depriving his fellows of one jot or tittle of their liberty. Civil society, indeed, is superior to the individual citizen, and in certain circumstances may abridge his liberty. Civil society, however, is endowed with this privileged pre-eminence for the sole purpose of rendering secure the personal liberty of its members by fostering among them the spirit of reciprocal justice, and repressing attempts on the part of some to invade the rights of others. If a fraction of this personal liberty is surrendered by the individual citizen to civil society, this is only with a view to the better protection of the reminder; and, even then, what is surrendered to civil society is what is strictly needed for its corporate life and integrity, so much and no more—so inalienable by will of nature and of nature's God is the boon of personal liberty!

Personal liberty is the sovereign end and aim of civil society. It is in civil society that personal liberty finds its safeguard against anarchy, the deadly foe, whose reign is that of might over right, of the strong over the weak, of the animal over the rational man.

Where personal liberty is violated—be the citizen who is the victim of lawlessness the poorest of the poor, the lowliest of the lowly—if civil society were to tolerate the outrage, it would betray its mission and forfeit the trust of its members who recognize in the liberty of one the liberty of all.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I desire to deal in particular with such violations of personal liberty as are not unfrequently attendant upon strikes of labor unions.

Usually, when a strike is entered upon by a union, measures are at once taken to prevent non-union workmen, or such union workmen as may not be in sympathy with the strike, from offering their labor to employers blacklisted by the edict of the union.

Although the recent strike of the Amalgamated Steel Association has been, in comparison with other strikes the records of which are not out of memory, free from acts of violence to persons or to property and from other riotous excesses, yet numerous incidents have occurred which challenge the serious attention of the upholders of personal liberty. In the districts covered by the strike hundreds of men willing to work have not been allowed to work. The approaches to the mills have been picketed by relays of strikers. Non-union men seeking to enter have been set upon and forced to retrace their steps, under penalty of bodily injury. When occasionally by stealth and ruse a few succeeded in evading the vigilance of the picketing lines, they were as prisoners in a jail, not daring to venture out and only with much difficulty providing themselves with the necessaries of life. At railroad stations and in streets men known or supposed to be non-union men have been pelted with stones, policemen being powerless to defend them even by making a display of bludgeons and firearms. In some cases non-union men have been kidnapped and locked up in hotels or empty storehouses; in other cases they have been roughly handled and badly beaten, specially harsh treatment being reserved for negroes who happened to appear on the scene. One Sunday morning in Chicago a squad of non-union men who had been imprisoned during the preceding week within their mill enclosures had the hardihood to believe that they would be secure from attack while going to hear mass in a neighboring church: they had to run the gauntlet of sticks and blows and were forced to regain hurriedly their hiding places.

In these and similar incidents the sufferers were not merely those who were the immediate victims of violence and of intimidation, but the much larger number of people throughout the country, who, were it not for the menace and injury that awaited them, would have come forward and obtained employment.

I am not discussing the question of strikes in the abstract,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

apart from incidents such as I now record; much less am I discussing the question of labor unions, to which I could readily assign numerous useful and praiseworthy purposes. I confine myself to those acts of violence and of intimidation which usually accompany strikes. Such acts, I assert, we cannot too strongly reprobate; nor can we, for the sake of public order and of personal liberty, be too zealous in awakening public opinion in condemnation of them.

That such acts constitute utter lawlessness edicts of legislators and decisions of courts leave no room for doubt. The English statute of 1875, known as "The Conspiracy and Protection Act" —a law, by the way, passed for the express purpose of enlarging the legal rights of labor unions in connection with strikes, and for this reason welcomed by the unions—so clearly sets forth what occurrences are to be taken as running counter to law in England, and so fully summarizes the sense of the scattered enactments and decisions of our legislatures and courts in America that I take the liberty of quoting from it at some length:

"Section 7. Every person who with a view to compel any other person to abstain from doing or to do any act which such other person has a legal right to do or abstain from doing, wrongfully and without legal authority.

"1. Uses violence or intimidates such other person, or his wife, or children, or injures his property, or,

"2. Persistently follows such other person about from place to place, or,

"3. Hides any tools, clothes, or other property, owned or used by such other person, or deprives him of, or hinders him in the use thereof, or,

"4. Watches or besets the house or other place where such other person resides or works or carries on business or happens to be, or the approach to such house, or place, or,

"5. Follows such person with two or more other persons in a disorderly manner in or through any street or road, shall on conviction be punished as provided," etc.

As to legislation in America, instances of laws and of decisions in a few of the States speak for the whole country.

In the State of Pennsylvania the statute on labor, most liberal as it is granted to be in its concessions to strikers, concludes with these words:

"Provided, that nothing herein contained shall prevent the prosecution and punishment under existent laws of any person or persons who shall in any way hinder persons who desire to labor for their employers, from so doing, or other persons from being employed as laborers." (Penn. Laws, 1875.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In South Carolina, in 1894, an injunction was issued against strikers who conspired to prevent the employer from employing workmen other than those suggested by the employees, and endeavored to accomplish their purpose "by threats, menaces, intimidations and opprobrious epithets addressed to plaintiff company's officers and workmen, and by gathering in crowds about the company's place of business and at the boarding places of their workmen, and by following said workmen to and from their work, stopping them on the highways, interfering with them in their work, and by holding them up to ridicule and contempt of bystanders."

The principle which underlies these and similar laws has been admirably enunciated by a judge of the State of Massachusetts (Carew vs. Rutherford), "Freedom is the policy of this country. But freedom does not imply a right in one person, either alone or in combination with others, to disturb or annoy another, either directly or indirectly, in his lawful business or occupation, for the sake of compelling him to buy his peace."

Such acts of violence and intimidation as are covered by the enactments and decisions quoted are, for the most part, far less detrimental to personal liberty than those that have been happening under our own eyes. Strange indeed is it that such things should be in America, the country of all countries where personal liberty is supposed to be most sacredly safeguarded. More strange still is it that such things are tolerated by State authorities who are either unwilling or unable to repress them!

A man's right to work is one of the most intimate rights of his being. It is the right to the exercise of his mental and bodily faculties. It is more—it is the right to his life, which depends for sustenance on the fruits of his labor. It is, for the same reason, the right of his wife and children to their lives. Of this right no man can with any shadow of equity deprive another; neither can any man by his own authority dictate to another when and how this right is to be used, else this other were his subject, his slave. And when in order to deprive a man of this right violence is done to him and bodily injury inflicted, then there is no measure to the injustice put upon him; all semblance of liberty is effaced; physical force becomes the ruling law in the relations of man to man.

Nor is it to be said that what is denied to one man may be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allowed to many banded together in associations or unions. Voluntary associations of citizens possess no right which is not inherent in the members as individuals. Associations, or unions, are mere aggregations of private citizens having no rights other than such as belong to private citizens.

I should be sorry to say a single word against the personal liberty of the strikers themselves, or of their friends. I should willingly allow them to use all peaceful means to lay their case before non-union workmen, to argue with them persuasively and eloquently, with a view to win their sympathy and co-operation. Neither should I object to the practice of picketing, so long as the purpose of picketing be merely to gain knowledge of the movements of employers or of non-union workers. But farther than this I cannot go. Where intimidation begins, where physical violence is brought into play, or where threats are used likely to put non-union workers in reasonable fear of life, limb or property —there must I stop, in obedience to the imperative dictates of natural justice and of Christian morality.

This is the position taken by men who are recognized to be among the distinguished moralists of the day. Father Matteo Liberatore, in his "Principles of Political Economy," dealing with the evils accompanying strikes, writes as follows:

"Worst of all is the iniquitous and brutal terrorism by which they (the strikers) compel their comrades to join them. If some workmen think it better to continue working on the same terms as before, what right have the others to force them into the strike by threats, insults and bad usage? Are they not free agents in their own affairs, to act as they think best? This is an unjust claim, an offence against the liberty of the subject, a disturbance of public peace, and deserves the utmost rigor of the law."

A higher authority than Father Liberatore is Leo XIII. In a letter addressed by him in 1888 to the Episcopate of Ireland on the system of boycotting which the Land League—with most admirable intentions, though with mistaken views of distributive justice—put in vogue in that country, the Sovereign Pontiff declares:

"It is in every way abhorrent to natural justice and Christian charity that those should be pursued by a novel kind of persecution and interdict (boycotting), who either are content with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the rents which they have agreed upon with the landlords of the estates and prefer to pay them, or who take empty farms as they have a right to do."

The argument of Leo plainly is that no private person, no association of private persons, however large and influential its membership, should attempt to prevent others from doing what they have a natural and legal right to do. That this argument which so forcibly vindicates the principle of personal liberty finds its application in the labor boycott of American strikers, as it did in the land boycott of Irish Land Leaguers, is easily seen.

To men who are entering upon a strike it should be clear that in preventing others from working they are acting in direct contradiction to the very principle of personal liberty, in virtue of which they justify themselves in ceasing to work. When individual workmen or combinations of workmen refuse to continue to work, no one claims the right to compel them to work, for the simple reason that in the enjoyment of their personal liberty they are free to work or not to work. But, evidently, the corollary of this is that men who choose to work must be allowed to work. Not many years ago an association of workmen initiating a strike had reason to expect summary treatment from law courts, prone as these were to interpret in a manner unfavorable to such collective action the various so-called Conspiracy Statutes strewn over the pages of English and American law books. Against such statutes and against the interpretations usually attached to them the friends of labor waged unceasing war in the name of personal liberty with the result that now, except in cases involving a breach of contract or entailing serious damage on public interests, labor unions may without risk of incurring the displeasure of the law initiate a strike and continue it as long as they may deem fit. Is it not strange that, after labor unions have won the long-fought battle for their own personal liberty, they should turn around and strive to wrest personal liberty from non-union workers? It would seem that labor unions sought to be a law to themselves apart from and above the law of the land.

I do not forget that labor unions often refuse to be responsible for the riotous excesses that accompany strikes, attributing these excesses to mobs which they cannot control and which see in strikes an opportunity of indulging in lawless passion. And, indeed, acts of violence do occur in connection with strikes, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the labor unions do not approve and for which they cannot be held responsible. Is it not, however, true that much at least of the interference with personal liberty of which we complain is the direct act of the unions? Are not the pickets of the unions usually the first to have recourse to threats and violence? And even where mobs are the guilty party are not the unions indirectly responsible? Should they not have foreseen the acts of violence to which the mobs so easily resort, and should they not have taken measures to obviate such acts? Should they not at least protest when such acts have unfortunately taken place?

The duty of the State in presence of strikes is clear and imperative. It is to protect personal liberty in all cases and at all costs. The entire authority of the State should, if necessary, be put in motion to protect the liberty of a single citizen, whether that citizen be one who refuses to work or one who desires to work. The State ascertains the will of the citizen in this regard, and then extends over it the shield of law. The law should be uniform for all and universal in its application without regard to person, or position, or class. "The duty of the public in trade disputes," once said Lord Derby, "is to make a ring and see fair play." The law should mercilessly put down intimidation and violence whencesoever they come. Its action should always be directed towards the freedom of the individual, be he workman or employer, unionist or free laborer. The refusal or the failure of the State to repress and punish violations of personal liberty is the introduction of anarchy.

It is sometimes urged on behalf of strikers that the workman has a sort of proprietary interest in his place, and that when another steps into it such a one is to a cerain extent an unjust aggressor, who deserves to be summarily dealt with. It is further maintained that, as strikes must fail if employers are allowed to fill the places of the strikers, compulsion brought to bear upon non-union men to prevent them from working is necessary as a measure of war and therefore justifiable. Statements of this kind, however, are social sophistries, which, if put into practice, would speedily undermine the structure of civil society. It is well understood by both parties to a labor contract—better understood, perhaps, by the employee than by the employer—that, in the absence of special covenants, the contract is rescindable at the will of either party. Moreover, when the workman as a matter

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of fact and of his own violition has vacated his place, it is not easy to understand how he can still retain a right in it. Again, if, as it is maintained, strikes must fail unless compulsion be employed to prevent non-union men from working, I have only to say, so much the worse for strikes. If strikes necessarily require as a condition of success the violation of personal liberty and the subversion of social order, then strikes stand self-condemned. Personal liberty and the good order of society must above all else be made secure. Whatever militates against the one, or the other, can have no toleration in the court of social justice, and must at all costs be put down. To speak of certain methods of action as measures of war when such methods are the devices of private citizens, or of associations of private citizens, is to characterize them by a name which of itself condemns them. Private citizens, or associations of private citizens, have no right to institute war; this is the exclusive right of public authority. To grant such a right to any class, or to any number of citizens, would be to open the flood-gates of lawlessness and anarchy. Measures of war adopted by employers against workmen would be permissible, and even the lynchings which we so much deprecate as blots upon American civilization would be justifiable. Law and public opinion are the natural and ultimate remedies for social grievances; any movement that ignores these two elements of social power is doomed to fail; any movement that puts its trust in them is sooner or later, if its cause be just, assured of success.

Still another specious argument in defence of violations of personal liberty in labor strikes is that in vast business combinations, and in the fierce competition resulting from them, capital is guilty of offences against personal liberty far more injurious to the public weal than those that can be laid to the charge of labor unions. This is not the place to enter upon a discussion of the operations and methods of capital. But, if wrong be done by capital, it does not follow that wrong should be done by labor; wrong in one case does not justify wrong in the other. If capital violates personal liberty and menaces social peace, let capital also be brought to the bar of law and public opinion.

To condemn the abuses against personal liberty which have marked the course of strikes in this and other countries is to serve the cause of labor and of labor unions. The most praise-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worthy cause may be ruined by the adoption of methods that reason and religion reprobate. Public opinion will not long tolerate what conduces to lawlessness and anarchy; it will put the ban upon associations which, however legitimate their purpose may be, tend to undermine law and order in society. The purpose will be forgotten in presence of the methods. Under the pressure of evil methods associations will inevitably suffer disintegration. Conscience and patriotism are alive in the bosoms of the men who constitute associations; conscience and patriotism rise higher than allegiance to any association.

The cause of labor is of itself so holy that all right-minded men, all Christians, must lend to it their sympathy and support. It is the cause of humanity; it is the cause of religion. Why should it not in its onward march so bear itself that no censure can attach to it, that no friend must be obliged to withdraw from it his esteem and his love?

JOHN IRELAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MAYOR AND THE REVISED NEW YORK CITY CHARTER.

BY HON. GEORGE L. RIVES, PRESIDENT OF THE COMMISSION TO REVISE THE NEW YORK CITY CHARTER.

THE City of New York now exists under a Charter enacted in 1897, and which went into effect on the first day of January, 1898. It will be superseded on the first day of January, 1902, by what is, in many respects, a new instrument.

The occasion for the Charter of 1897 was the consolidation of the then City of New York—containing something less than two million inhabitants—with the City of Brooklyn and with a wide extent of agricultural and suburban territory included in nearly ninety towns and villages. The entire population of the municipality thus created is, in round figures, about three and a half millions, and the conditions of its different parts are heterogeneous to a remarkable degree. The lower east side of Manhattan, inhabited largely by Russian and Polish Jews, is believed to be the most densely populated spot in the world. In Queens, the largest in territory of the five boroughs into which the city is subdivided, as also in Richmond, there are large stretches of purely agricultural land, and much lonely marsh and salt meadow. Brooklyn consists chiefly of a great extent of small houses without any excessive congestion of population. Flushing, Westchester Village, and New Brighton are typical centres for suburban homes.

The scheme of the Charter of 1897 looked to a complete administrative and legislative centralization of all this conglomeration of parts. The city, it is true, was subdivided into the five boroughs of Manhattan, Brooklyn, The Bronx, Queens and Richmond; but these boroughs were little more than geographical expressions, and (except in the case of their public schools) possessed not the very least autonomy. In the main the features of the Charter of the former City of New York were re-enacted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and extended throughout all the boroughs. Their finances were managed and their taxes collected by a central department. There was one Police Department, one Fire Department, and one Board of Health. There was a Department of Highways, a Department of Sewers, a Department of Public Buildings, a Department of Water Supply, a Department of Bridges—each practically independent of the others, and each charged with duties extending through the whole area of the city.

Over all the departments was the Mayor, in appearance supreme, but in reality nearly powerless as an executive during the greater part of his term of office. He had indeed the unrestricted power as vacancies might occur to appoint every head of a department, except the head of the Department of Finance. And during the first six months of his term he had the unrestricted power to remove any public officer holding office by appointment from the Mayor, except members of school boards and minor magistrates. During the other three years and six months the Mayor could only remove his subordinates "for cause upon charges preferred and after opportunity to be heard," and then only with the approval of the Governor of the State.

At first sight, and to the ordinary mind, the requirement that a city official should not be dismissed by the Mayor except for cause and after an opportunity to be heard, seems but a reasonable provision to prevent hasty or arbitrary action. But the courts take quite a different view of this seemingly harmless provision. The Court of Appeals decided twenty years ago that it was not a mere administrative regulation; that a charge, when preferred, must be sustained by formal proof; that the accused had a right to appear by counsel; that the Mayor, in hearing charges against his subordinates, acted in a quasi-judicial capacity; and that his decision was in consequence reviewable by the courts.* The Mayor, therefore, if he wished to dismiss a head of department who had turned out to be careless or inefficient, was required first to conduct a trial with all the formality of a court of law; next to get the Governor of the State to approve his action; and finally the Supreme Court of the State and the Court of Appeals must be induced to confirm the sentence. The results were deplorable. In the words of one learned and experienced judge, "Such a construction virtually prevents all removals, and reduces the scheme

*People *ex rel.* Mayor v. Nichols, 79 N. Y. 582.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Charter to an incongruous absurdity."† Under the Charter of 1897 every head of department, for the last seven-eighths of the Mayor's term of office, was in effect relieved from any fear of punishment—except so far as he might be affected by public opinion or reached by the criminal courts. He certainly was not in any effective way under the control of the Mayor.

The Mayor on his part was relieved of responsibility for the conduct of the several departments. Having but six months in which to remove at will, any Mayor would almost of necessity make within that time what is called "a clean sweep" and fill all the offices with his own friends—or at least with the nominees of the political faction to which he happened to belong. When the six months were at an end his powers were exhausted. The administration of the city's affairs were vested thenceforward in eighteen separate and independent departments, each with its irremovable head and subject to no common official control. The Mayor might be held responsible for the wisdom or unwisdom of his original appointments. He could not be held responsible otherwise. He might disapprove the acts of a subordinate, but he had no effectual means of forbidding them. He might scold, but he could not command.

Another feature of the Charter of 1897 which was of great importance was the peculiar system of financial administration inherited from the former City of New York. Nominally the annual budget was voted by the local legislature—the Municipal Assembly. Actually the Assembly was limited to a mere formal approval of the budget as drafted by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment. This Board, which had been doing valuable service in the city for twenty-five years, consisted of the Mayor, the Comptroller, the President of the Council, the Corporation Counsel, and President of the Tax Department. The Comptroller was the head of the Finance Department. The President of the Council was the Deputy Mayor, and presided over the upper house of the Municipal Assembly. They were both elective officers, chosen at the same time, by the same constituency, and for the same term of office as the Mayor. The Corporation Counsel and the President of the Tax Department were appointees of the Mayor.

†Dissenting opinion of DAVIS, P. J., in People *ex rel.* Nichols v. Cooper, 21 Hun. 517.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Besides the annual budget for current expenses, the city must every year raise large sums of money by loans, either to retire maturing obligations or to provide for new public improvements. Under the Charter of 1897 the authority for every loan was to be first granted by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, and their action was then to be ratified by a vote of three-fourths of all the members of each house of the Municipal Assembly. The Assembly had in the matter of loans rather more power than in the matter of the annual budget, and it sometimes chose to delay the necessary ratification. But for most practical purposes it may be said that the financial policy of the city was determined in the long run by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, over which the Mayor presided, and of which he was the leadiing member.

Such were some of the more important features of the Charter of 1897, an instrument which had been severely criticized at the time of its enactment, and which had not increased in favor in actual operation. Innumerable amendments were constantly proposed, and finally the State Legislature authorized the Governor to appoint a commission to examine into the effect and working of the Charter, and to suggest amendments. The commission, as required by the terms of their appointment, presented their report to the Governor in December, 1900, in which they dwelt upon the two fundamental defects above noted of too much centralization and too little real responsibility. These defects they sought to remedy by centering responsibility and, in some measure, decentralizing administration.

For this purpose they recommended two very radical changes. First, they advised that the boroughs should be made autonomous, so far as related to the care of their own streets, sewers and public buildings—all such work to be under the sole control of a locally elected official styled the Borough President. Second, they advised that the Mayor should have power to remove any official holding office by appointment from a Mayor (except School Commissioners, Magistrates, etc.) "whenever in his judgment the public interests shall so require." As a consequence of this grant of a power of removal, they suggested that no appointed public officer should hold his office for any specific term—except in the case again of Magistrates and the members of certain boards, of which the members were to retire in rotation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The powers of the Mayor were thus diminished by removing entirely from the control of his appointees all such matters as were to be separately administered in each borough; and inasmuch as all such public works as the construction, repair and maintenance of highways and sewers constantly require the employment of large numbers of men, the power and patronage of the Borough Presidents under the scheme of the commission became very great, and the political value of the Mayor's patronage was correspondingly diminished. On the other hand, the Mayor's real control over administration was enormously increased by his absolute power of removal, and he was thus made more effectually responsible for the efficient conduct of the departments of law, police, fire, and health, the supply of water, the cleaning of the streets, the maintenance of the city's bridges and parks, the collection of taxes, and the proper conduct of the hospitals and prisons.

One further important change was recommended which directly affected the Mayor. The composition of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment was changed, and its powers were enlarged. The change in the composition of the Board was suggested, not so much because it was thought desirable in itself, as because it seemed a necessary consequence of the proposed autonomous borough government and the unlimited power of removal conferred on the Mayor. The authority to appropriate money for the local purposes of the several boroughs—whether from annual taxation or as the proceeds of loans—seemed to make it proper that each borough should have a direct representation on the Board. As the Mayor's power of removal was to be enlarged, it was evident that his appointees would be under his influence to a far greater extent than before, and that he would have actually three votes out of five if the Board were left unchanged.

The commission therefore recommended that the Board of Estimate should be composed solely of elective officers, viz.: The Mayor, the Comptroller, and the President of the Board of Aldermen (elected by the city at large), and the Presidents of the five Boroughs (each elected locally). But, said the commission:

"in adding the Borough Presidents to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment another question required consideration. If the Borough Presidents were to possess a voting power, not only equal to that of each other, but also to that of the other members of the Board, they might together control its decisions; and this would mean that the financial control of the city would pass from the officials who are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not directly interested in the spending of the city's money to officers at the head of great administrative agencies and charged with the duty of spending large sums in the development and improvement of the particular localities they were elected to represent. It therefore seemed essential that the total voting power of the five Borough Presidents should be less than that of the officers elected from the city at large; and it was not thought just to give to the representatives of the smaller boroughs an equal vote with the Presidents of the two great Boroughs of Manhattan and Brooklyn.

"What should be the representation of the different elements in the Board of Estimate and Apportionment has been one of the most difficult questions which the Commission has had to answer. We propose to give three votes to each of the officers elected at large; two votes each to the Presidents of the Boroughs of Manhattan and Brooklyn; and one vote each to the Presidents of The Bronx, Queens and Richmond. It will be perceived that the total number of votes in the Board will be sixteen, and that nine of these votes will be cast by the officers elected at large, assuring to them a control of the Board."

The extensive modification thus proposed in the composition of the Board of Estimate and Apportionment obviously would effect a very substantial change in the relation of the Mayor toward the Board. Under the Charter of 1897 and the preceding charter of the old City of New York, the Mayor was by all odds the most important personage in the Board. Two of its five members were his appointees, while the other two, elected on the same ticket with him, were almost necessarily in political harmony with him. Under the proposed revision the Mayor would no longer be the official creator or patron of any of his colleagues on the Board; and, as the Borough Presidents were to be elected by entirely different constituencies from those that elected the Mayor, they might be and often would be politically opposed to him.

In general the recommendations of the Revision Commission were acceptable to the State Legislature of 1901. Most of the proposed amendments to the Charter were enacted into law, to go into effect on the first day of January, 1902; and the next Mayor of New York will therefore take office for the term and with the powers and duties prescribed by the revised Charter. But in two highly important respects the carefully adjusted scheme of the commission has been departed from. The Mayor's term of office has been cut down from four years to two; which means practically cutting down the term of office of his appointees in like manner. And the Mayor's responsibility for the conduct of the police has been weakened by giving both to the Governor of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State, and also to the Mayor, the absolute power to remove the Commissioner of Police whenever in the judgment of either of them the public interest may require it. The second of these changes was made after extensive discussion and for well understood political reasons. The reduction in the length of the Mayor's term of office was unfortunately effected in the State Legislature without debate, and without any public statement by the party leaders of the object or purpose of the change.

Both changes have this effect in common, that they serve to make it more difficult for any Mayor to find fit men to take office under him. It is hard enough to get men who can earn a good living in other employments to enter the public service in any subordinate capacity. It is harder to get such men to take office for two years than for four. And it will be almost impossible to secure the services of a capable and self-respecting man where, as in the case of the Police Commissioner, the appointee to keep his place must satisfy two independent and sometimes hostile masters.

In other respects than those above referred to the amendments to the Charter do not materially affect the office of Mayor. His power to veto the ordinances of the local legislature—hereafter to be known as the Board of Aldermen—is little changed. No measure disapproved by him can take effect unless repassed by the votes of at least two-thirds of all the members of the Board; if the measure involves the expenditure of money or the creation of a debt, a three-fourths vote is necessary; while if it involves the grant of a franchise, the Mayor's veto is final. This is a tremendous weapon of defence, because indirectly the Mayor is thus given a veto over the Board of Estimate and Apportionment. On many subjects, such as the annual budget, the issue of loans for certain purposes, and the grant of franchises, the resolutions of the Board of Estimate are not valid till ratified by the Aldermen and approved by the Mayor.

The principal powers and duties of the Mayor as prescribed by the Charter are therefore: the unrestricted power to appoint and remove at will his principal subordinates; the duty of sitting on the Board of Estimate and Apportionment and shaping the financial policy of the city; and the power to veto all ordinances of the Board of Aldermen, including those framed by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment. Outside of the Charter pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

visions he has the duty, under the State Constitution, of examining acts passed by the Legislature, and the valuable power of suspensive veto. He is a member *ex officio* of some important bodies, such as the Rapid Transit Commission and the Trustees of the Sailors' Snug Harbor. He has also the really important duty of representing the city on all ceremonial occasions.

And yet, notwithstanding his possession of all this great authority, the Mayor of New York will continue to serve under the most serious limitations upon his usefulness. He must overcome, of course, such difficulties as are common to every executive officer of the United States—the exaggerated and hysterical activity of the press, the adroit schemes of individuals to reach the public treasury, the unceasing pressure of the great corporations which depend for their existence upon the possession of franchises in the public streets. Beyond this, he must also meet obstacles which are perhaps peculiar to the City of New York. In the first place, his administration will be hampered during the entire first half of his term of office by the fact that the budget for the year has already been fixed beyond recall under his predecessor.* In the second place, the Board of Aldermen under the revised Charter may exercise a very important influence in helping or hindering reforms and economies. But the recent traditions attached to the office of Alderman, and the lack of opportunities for useful public service that have heretofore existed, have induced capable men to refrain from seeking elections and make it improbable that for some time to come that Board will prove helpful to the Mayor. In the third place, there are the exasperating difficulties of filling the principal offices, upon whose efficient conduct the success of the Mayor's administration must mainly depend. The shortness of the term of office, the insufficient salaries, and the necessarily rigid system under which public business must be conducted, all combine to discourage the best men from accepting office.

But probably the most serious difficulty with which a Mayor must contend is the constant menace of legislation by the State authorities, sometimes merely useless, often in a direction opposed to the true interests of the city. In the matter of expenditure

*By a special provision of the revised Charter, the Board of Estimate and Apportionment may amend the budget for 1902 at any time before May 1, 1902. This exception was made necessary by the adoption of the new borough system, and is contrary to the general financial policy of the Charter.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alone, the efforts of the best disposed city officials will always be paralyzed so long as the salaries of the army of policemen, firemen and school teachers are fixed in Albany.

The truth is that the political conditions under which the City of New York is governed, are quite anomalous. Under the Federal Constitution the State of New York has exclusive power of legislation over all the ordinary subjects of municipal activity; and the State Legislature not only has this exclusive power to deal with city affairs, but it has always shown itself exceedingly ready to exercise it. Moreover, the vote of the city in national elections has almost always been opposed to the vote of the rest of the State, and the constituencies happen to be so made up that the Democratic party—which is in a large majority in the city—is almost always in a minority in the Legislature. Mr. Tilden's estimate was that the Democratic party must carry the State by fifty thousand majority in order to carry the Legislature; and the figure would probably be greater to-day.

We have therefore the case of a sovereign State of considerable extent, of great wealth, containing some seven million inhabitants, in which half the people and more than half the wealth are contained in one huge city. We have moreover a sovereign Legislature, not engrossed by other more important work, not friendly politically, and willing to interfere at any moment in the regulation of the city's local affairs. The consequences are, first, an enormous mass of confused, ill-digested and constantly shifting legislation, which deals with almost inconceivable minuteness with matters of the most trivial concern; and, second, an inevitable tendency on the part of the people of the city to look to the rest of the State for relief from unsatisfactory conditions, rather than to rely for help upon their own exertions.

Against such a state of things protests have been earnest and long continued, and conditions are improving. At one time the Mayor was appointed by the Governor of the State. At a later period the heads of the Police and Fire departments were appointed in the same way. Only thirty years ago the budget of the city was voted at Albany. Until 1895 laws might be finally passed by the State Legislature affecting the city's most important interests without any notice to the local authorities, and of course without any opportunity to protest. And it was the effort of the Revision Commission of 1900, as it was the effort of the framers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Charter of 1897, to obviate much useless or harmful State legislation by equipping the city "with power to decide for itself what it will do within the well-recognized range of ordinary municipal activity," as well as by conferring upon its executive officers adequate powers to carry out efficiently any policy it might adopt.

How far this latest experiment for home rule will prove successful must largely depend on the character and capacity of the officers whom the people elect.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that although the opportunities of the Mayor for useful public service are to some extent limited by the unyielding requirements of State statutes and by the conditions and traditions surrounding public office, yet his opportunities for harm are bounded only by the length of his term of office. An evil disposed or negligent or dull man as Mayor can always work incalculable mischief by bad appointments, or by promoting or not opposing measures intended to rob the city treasury. The ablest and best-intended Mayor cannot, perhaps, under existing conditions do much efficient or lasting work of a constructive kind; but he has ample power and will have ample opportunity to prevent an immense amount of harm. In the short period of two years he can hardly hope to effect extensive economies or to institute far-reaching and thorough reforms. What he can fairly hope to do is to see that the city takes no detriment; to insist upon and secure at least an honest administration; and to put a stop to much evil legislation. The man who can really do this, laboring for the interests of the city alone and not for himself or for the interests of any party or faction, is sure of a high place in the esteem and affection of the people.

GEORGE L. RIVES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF A GREAT CITY.

BY HON. BIRD S. COLER, COMPTROLLER OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

THE science of municipal government made great progress during the nineteenth century along several important lines, but at the beginning of the twentieth century no large city in America had a perfect financial system. Constitutional restrictions, laws, ordinances and methods for public education, sanitation, public improvements and administration have all been modernized and generally improved to meet changed conditions, but a majority of the great municipalities of the country are compelled to conduct their financial affairs under restrictions imposed fifty to one hundred years ago to safeguard the interests of towns and villages.

Banks, business houses and private corporations change their financial systems and business methods to meet new conditions, seeking always to keep abreast of the times and to utilize improvements. The financial affairs of the City of New York, with its vast population, enormous resources and extensive public interests and responsibilities, are to-day regulated by a system adapted to a period when the streets were unpaved, the value of public utilities unknown, and merchants burned oil lamps in front of their stores when the moon was not shining. Franchises granted by the city are to-day the basis of the existence of a score of great corporations, most of them of enormous earning power, yet the public revenue derived from this source is insignificant, and in many cases the method of collecting it is crude and uncertain.

New York has developed two great public utilities into profit paying investments with the net revenue steadily increasing, yet every dollar so expended is a charge against its credit limitation, and this great municipality is placed in the peculiar and unbusinesslike predicament of growing richer and poorer at the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same time. The borrowing capacity of the city is reduced by the real estate it owns, and further reduced by the amount of every bond sold to pay for a public improvement that will yield a profit on the investment. No private business could long survive such a financial system. The restriction that is now oppressive and useless was probably necessary when it was adopted, but it should be changed to meet new conditions and modern possibilities.

While most of the older cities of the country suffer more or less embarrassment or inconvenience from antiquated laws or charters, New York is especially unfortunate in this respect. The blame for the present unbusinesslike financial situation, if blame there be, is chargeable to that strong element of public and political opinion that is proved to be over conservative in all matters affecting municipal credits and finance. The Constitution of the State limits the borrowing capacity of cities to ten per cent. of the assessed value of taxable real estate, excepting from this provision only bond issues necessary for protecting the public health or providing additional water supply. The real estate owned by the City, valued on a basis of the assessed valuation of private property at more than $400,000,000, instead of increasing the credit or debt margin, reduces permanently the borrowing capacity of the municipality by more than $40,000,000. The credit of the City therefore rests not upon the property it owns, but upon the real estate of private owners on which taxes are collected. For example, if a reckless administration should give away Central Park to private individuals on a tax value of $86,000,000, the City could then borrow $8,600,000 on the land sold, but cannot borrow a cent on the same security while owning it.

This method of restricting the indebtedness of municipalities is peculiar to New York, and it was inserted in the State Constitution at a time when the wisest and most far-sighted statesmanship had not foreseen that cities might one day become great corporate enterprises, developing their natural resources into paying properties. States with more modern constitutions limit municipal indebtedness, but in most cases they do it by fixing a maximum rate of municipal taxation. When it is established by organic law that the income of a city cannot exceed a certain sum annually, the expenditures of that municipality are effectually limited. All these constitutional limitations may be wise in a way, and doubtless were necessary in the first instance, but

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

almost without exception they antedate the successful development of public utilities by municipal corporations. They are invariably arbitrary and cannot be adjusted to local or special conditions.

The City of New York, on account of geographical location and the magnitude of its resources and material possibilities, might reasonably expect of the State special consideration and legislation for the adjustment of its finances. Other large cities in other States possess similar claims to special privileges, but, like New York they are all confined within the same organic legal limitations that bind the smaller cities and towns of the interior. These restrictions were imposed long before the possibilities of public utilities and franchises were realized, but it is a difficult matter to obtain even moderate modifications to meet special conditions. Therefore a businesslike and up to date financial system cannot be quickly established.

In some respects the financial condition of New York is unique. It is one of the few seaport cities of the world owning its water front or possessing the right to acquire that which is not already owned. In recent years an expenditure of some $30,000,000 in the acquisition of land and the construction of modern piers and bulkheads has created a dock property that is not only of inestimable value to the commercial interests of the City, but yields a revenue ranging from two to three and one-half per cent. above the interest on the bonds issued to pay for the improvements. In brief, a Sinking Fund is provided that will offset the bonds before they mature, leaving the City a great unencumbered property paying a net revenue of six or seven per cent. on the original cost.

But with this possibility of a public utility demonstrated, the financial system forced upon the City by organic law compels the charging of all dock bonds against the borrowing capacity or debt limit of the City, and consequently greatly restricts a public improvement that not only yields direct profit, but greatly benefits the general commercial interests of the community. The controlling financial regulations of the City's water department were regarded as liberal, if not generous, at the time they were created, because an abundant water supply was known to be essential to the existence of an urban community. The original water works, costing a large sum of money, have been developed into a profitable investment, yielding revenue beyond the interest on the origi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nal cost. The net revenue will increase steadily as the system is perfected and extended and waste is reduced to a minimum. Yet, with the fact demonstrated by years of experience that supplying water is a safe and profitable investment for the municipality, the bonds outstanding for the present system are a charge against the debt limit.

New York has developed two great public utilities into sources of net revenue—her docks and her water system—and has thereby demonstrated that old fashioned financial restrictions and limitations may be safely modified to meet modern conditions. What New York has done other cities may do, because all have many conditions in common. Existing safeguards of municipal credit antedate the general tendency to derive a fair revenue from all assets that are the property of the people. It would not be wise to remove all these restrictions at once—in fact, municipalities must be exceedingly cautious of experiments with credit and investments—but where the improvement of a public utility has been successful as a source of revenue, further development along that line should not be a charge against the general credit or borrowing capacity. Municipalities may not undo the mistakes of the past, but they need not repeat them, and like individuals they should profit by experience.

Most of the laws regulating the financial systems of great cities were enacted at a time when public franchises were not recognized as available assets. Not so long ago municipalities, instead of charging for the private use of streets and highways, readily granted almost any permit asked for with a general view to promoting growth of population and private wealth. Such a method of development may be necessary, or at least permissible, in small and struggling municipalities ambitious for a rapid growth, but in a great city where every franchise right has a dividend paying value that may be closely estimated, the financial systems of the future must make the most of all sources of revenue that lighten the burden of taxation. Franchises that are worth assured dividends to the private interests that obtain them should yield a point for the municipality, and where they represent great public utilities the revenue in question might be set aside as a sinking fund to acquire the property when it is no longer an experiment.

Public ownership of all profitable public utilities would at first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

glance seem to be an essential part of any correct system of municipal finance, but cities must proceed to such a system with caution and by slow degrees. In the first place, where the franchises have been granted without adequate compensation the municipality cannot confiscate or partially destroy private right, and where an experiment is to be made it should never endanger the public credit. But where a public utility has been successfully developed into a profit yielding investment and there is opportunity to extend the development the temporary indebtedness that may be necessary for the purpose should not affect the credit of the city and should not curtail its borrowing power.

The financing of the construction of the Underground Rapid Transit Railroad in New York affords a striking illustration of the peculiarities of the financial system by which the City is so often embarrassed. The bonds of the City are issued to pay for the construction; yet the City is secured on a contract that provides for the interest and principal of the securities, the whole to be paid within fifty years and at the end of that period the road becomes the property of the City. At the end of fifty years the principal and interest of all the bonds issued for this work will have been paid from the revenue received by the municipality from the operation of the road. The entire property then reverts to the City free of cost to the taxpayers, and all receipts of the future above operating expenses go into the general treasury for the reduction of taxation. So far the plan is excellent; but under our present financial system the entire issue of bonds, $36,000,000, is a charge against the credit and borrowing capacity of the City from the time of letting the contract. While the private investment involved is paying interest and providing a sinking fund the credit of the City is curtailed for the full amount, and therefore other developments must be delayed.

The Rapid Transit Railroad is, it is true, a financial experiment, and therefore caution is essential to safety, but after the road has been in operation, say five years, if the earnings are ample to meet contract requirements, then the credit of the City that is involved should be released that it may be devoted to other profitable purposes. Along the same line the borrowing capacity of the City might be safely relieved of the charge of all bonds for completed water works and dock improvements that are yielding ample revenue for interest and sinking fund. There

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would be neither risk nor experiment in such an arrangement. In fact, the City of New York under a correct financial system established by organic law might spend $100,000,000 in further improvement of its great water front and derive enough income from the investment to retire the entire debt in less than thirty years. The same principle is applicable to any municipality with similar natural resources and public utilities.

The financial problems of all cities include the much discussed and never settled question of the proper adjustment of the proportion of money spent that is to be raised by direct taxation and the amount to be taxed upon future generations through the medium of bond issues. The general and apparently popular division is to tax the present for current expenses and the future for permanent improvements. This rule, however, need not be imperative and the division may be safely adapted to special conditions. The general tendency in all financial transactions is toward lower rates of interest, and cities when they borrow money should issue long term bonds with the privilege of funding them at any time that a lower rate may be obtained.

The perfect system of municipal finance is not yet in sight, but safe and steady progress toward improvement is apparent in many directions. Ancient methods and antiquated restrictions must soon give way to the imperative demands of intellectual advance. The credit of a great municipality must not be trifled with or subjected to rash experiments, but cities must not repeat the mistakes of the past. Municipal credit cannot be protected or promoted by a policy that limits or restricts income. Great cities should not be seriously hampered in the work of developing profitable public utilities. A city is a great business corporation, and its finances must be adjusted on sound business principles.

BIRD S. COLER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL DANGER FROM POLICE CORRUPTION.

BY HON. FRANK MOSS, FORMER COMMISSIONER OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK CITY.

THE corruption of the police force of New York is a fact that nobody in the city denies seriously. It is believed throughout the nation and over the world. So well settled is the belief, so well sustained by a series of discoveries, confessions and revelations, so well fortified by circumstances of police activity and negligence, success and failure, so well illustrated by the character and the conduct of those who lead and direct the department, that nobody doubts the disposition and the ability of the commanders to do, or order, or permit any of the wicked acts charged against them. No serious accusation against them, however grave, is received with incredulity.

This ominous attitude of the public mind is not a sudden result of unusual revelations. It comes from the suspicion of many years, verified by the unfolding of facts during the greater part of the last eight years. These revelations all point in the same direction, and are explicable only by the theory of corruption among the higher officials of the Police Department.

The common people, with minds made acute by these revelations, have themselves verified these criminal conditions in the acts and in the omissions of the police force.

This criminal condition has never been charged to mere inefficiency or to inadequacy of means and supplies, for the force is large—seven thousand five hundred strong. It is elaborately organized; it is maintained with an extravagant outlay of public money; it is burly and brave to a fault; and it has demonstrated many times its complete co-ordination in itself and with the city government and its exceptional ability to do what it sets out to do.

With general unanimity the people lay the derelictions of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

police force to great financial and political corruption; the nation and the world approve the verdict.

In New York it is fully realized that this corrupt inefficiency exists with the permissive approval of the city government. It is indeed but one of the elements in a general system of corruptly and selfishly making money and creating political power out of the people's trust and out of the opportunities of office.

Let us enumerate some of the facts that have been proven by testimony and by the observation of the citizens.

Hundreds of gambling houses and pool rooms exist. Until they were attacked by private societies they were operated publicly, continuously and openly, like saloons or stores. The police authorities have seldom made a raid or an arrest in these places, although their attention has been directed to them by the newspapers, by hundreds of citizens, by a legislative committee and by private societies and committees These places are attended by great numbers of persons. While the police utterly fail to enforce or even attempt to enforce the law, the private societies by voluntary actions and privately contributed means make many raids, succeeding always, except where the police successfully interfere with their plans.

The police go so far as to profess ignorance and to deny the location of the pool rooms, although these are well known to many thousands of citizens. They profess ignorance not only of the location but also of the signs and the methods of the illegal business.

It has been proven by the private societies that police agencies close to the executive power of the department have invented systems for warning pool rooms and protecting them against raids; have provided money to corrupt agents of the societies and to purchase their plans, and have actually given the use of the telephone service of the Police Department itself to the pool room backers to make warnings and protection more secure!

The Deputy Chief of Police, who is the actual head of the department, is the boon companion of a man who stands at the head of one of the pool room syndicates, and he attends the race tracks and lays bets with him openly. He has never attacked a place in that man's combination.

It has been proven that this Deputy Chief with his former odorous record was placed originally in his commanding position

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in consequence of the direct issue made in the former Police Board on the subject of protecting pool rooms.

It is charged and generally believed that the gambling rooms of New York City pay immense sums of money in order to secure immunity. It is clearly seen that they receive not only immunity but also friendly treatment from the police authorities, their only troubles coming from the private societies which are brilliantly successful in their attacks. The pool room condition stands fully demonstrated in New York. There is no doubt of it whatever.

There are not less than a thousand policy shops, and their condition is similar to that of the pool rooms. In the midst of these well known facts, police detectives swear in legal proceedings that they don't know how the game is operated and don't know the difference between a policy gig and a doctor's gig. Many lottery offices exist under similar conditions.

Fully a thousand disorderly houses are practically unmolested by the police. Many of them are outrageously vile, noisy and offensive. Respectable families are compelled to suffer without redress. Some of the inmates are mere children. There is a regular system of procuring girls from the country by advertising for servants and waitresses. In many localities women and children cannot look out of the back windows of their homes without seeing shocking sights in protected dens. Until the Committee of Fifteen undertook its famous work upon the East Side the children in the tenement houses were condemned by the government of New York City to grow up under the most demoralizing conditions without assistance from the police authorities, who were in the pay of criminals. The decoying and abducting and ruining of girls was, and in many places continues to be, a regular trade in houses and by persons obviously under the protection of the police. Men prominent in the Department or among its political sponsors are seen to be interested and active in these practices. In many open and frequented concert halls most disgusting performances occur regularly; many gilded amusement palaces are nothing but exchanges for vice. In these places—the so-called dives—the youth of our city in thousands are corrupted. And the youth of New York City is constantly recruited from the youth of the whole land. Many are caught in dens of nameless vice which are well known and which operate under the same apparent conditions of police aid and protection.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The violation of the excise law, which is patent to all, means money for the police.

Whole sections of the city have been terrorized by burglars. The condition has led a certain bonding company to make a special department in its business of insuring against burglaries, claiming that the risk was four times as great as the risk of fire!

Pickpockets and highwaymen flourish. Many of the disorderly women rob men in houses and on the streets—some of them even committing highway robbery—and their protectors are so careful of them that often they frighten away the victims.

Pocketbook, flim-flam, green goods swindlers and others are numerous and find many victims. There is a general accusation that the activity of these crooks is due to the friendliness of the police or the powers that control the police.

In the Lexow investigation and before the Police Board the system of blackmail and extortion which gave the police their reason for not interfering with illegal resorts was fully proven. Since then other specifications and charges have been made. Wardman Bissert, the confidential man for Captain Diamond, has just been convicted criminally on such a charge. He collected an initiation fee of $500 and monthly payments thereafter of $50. As his precinct has been full of disorderly and gambling houses, the inference is irresistible that this was but one example of many. Thus the existence of the large number of evil resorts throughout the city without any effective police interference fully satisfies the people that the same old dishonest conditions continue. The amount of tribute believed to be collected annually runs up into the millions of dollars.

The most revolting story of all is that of the women of the street. When we find a private citizen living on the gains of these miserable, diseased creatures, we execrate and spurn him. Yet there is no doubt that many of the sworn and uniformed guardians of the law take from these women unofficial license fees, and, reserving their own percentage, pass on the very wages of shame to officials higher up, who continue to pass it along until it reaches its destination.

Bob Nelson, the companion of the Deputy Commissioner of Police, has long done a thriving business in bailing out unfortunate women at a profit of $5 apiece, sometimes scores of them in a week. It has been charged that the police of one of the pre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cincts made a special point of bringing in these women in large numbers and of notifying the Chief's friend so that he could make his fee out of them.

Even the pushcart men and the keepers of fruit and peanut stands yield blackmail. On the East Side with its hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of these humble merchants this business of police collection has been reduced to a science.

It has been abundantly proven that merchants who occupy portions of the sidewalk continuously, or during portions of the day, have to make regular contributions for the police, and that when they make these payments they are not molested. The same conditions are manifest to-day and nobody doubts that the payments are made.

To sum up, wherever there is apparent a violation of the corporation ordinances, or the possibility that a legal complaint may be but is not made, there we may be sure the hand of the blackmailer and the extortioner is at work. All believe it—know it. One business man told me that he didn't believe the Prætorian Guard could have held its own with the New York police force.

A most distressing and dangerous symptom of the degeneration of the police force is the insolence and the brutality displayed by many of its members who possess what is called a "pull." The policeman who is a chosen instrument of the political leaders, or of the blackmailers of the Department, may of course do as he pleases. He is immune.

For three years there has been through the courts and the streets a dreary procession of citizens with broken heads and bruised bodies against few of whom was violence needed to effect an arrest. Many of them had done nothing to deserve arrest. In a majority of such cases no complaint is made. If the victim complains, his charge is generally dismissed.

The police are practically above the law. Yet in these three years instances have been frequent of policemen in flagrant criminal acts, which after all were directly the result of the bad example of their superiors.

Is it any wonder that under such an official system the guardians of the law themselves commit at times such crimes as burglary and larceny?

A year ago the colored people of a certain precinct were attacked by the white rowdies of their district and were very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

severely handled. For two days this race riot continued without any earnest attempt by the police to stop it and to protect the colored people. Worse than that, awful beatings and clubbings were administered by policemen to colored men when they were fleeing from mobs and when they were in the very act of begging the police for protection. It was not until the whole city was aroused with indignation and that other people poured into that precinct that the police quelled the disturbance. Storekeepers there told me privately of awful things that they had seen, and of the participation of commanding officers in them; but begged not to be called as witnesses, because, as they said, the policemen were friendly to the roughs who would be permitted to wreck their stores.

Good policemen, of whom there are very many among the patrolmen, are afraid to arrest roughs for fear that they may prove to be politicians' heelers, and thus the officers might be punished for interfering. The patrolmen say that such action on their part results usually in their being transferred to precincts distant from their homes.

It has been proved that promotions in the Police Department were made for money. Thousands of dollars have been paid for the higher positions. The symptoms of those conditions are apparent now. It is charged under oath and believed that transfers and details to special duties cost money, and that exemption from unpleasant transfers and assignments may be bought. If policemen have to pay money for these things, are they not under peculiar temptation to recoup from the criminals in their jurisdiction, and is not the Department bound to let them do so, to say nothing of the desire of the higher officials and of their political bosses to farm the system and the Department to its highest financial possibility? It is most sad to realize that the police force as a whole has small reputation for truth. Degeneration in moral character has made it necessary to develop a phenomenal power for concealing and denying the truth. The good men are forced into this position by brute force and physical fear. They believe that the man who tells the secrets of the Department is doomed to persecution and to ruin. While we know that large sums have been raised by assessing the individual policeman to influence legislation, and while many of them admit it privately in confidence, the most patient and persistent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

effort has never yet been able to get the truth of the matter from policemen in public and under oath.

Recently a sergeant appeared at headquarters and made a complaint of fighting against two policemen. Every patrolman who was in the station house at the time the fight took place—and there were more than a dozen—gave the lie to his superior; the Commissioner wearily dismissed the complaint.

Untruthful testimony has frequently been given to aid in the conviction of persons whom the superior officers of the Police Department have determined to convict. The District Attorney is compelled to consider the fact that juries doubt uncorroborated police testimony. It is a fact that women and children and citizens generally do not go to the policeman for information, advice, and help with the confidence and the trust that they once did.

Yet, in spite of all this corruption, and the relentless terrorism that is used to keep the members of the police force in line with their superiors and their manipulators, there are very many who are faithful, courageous and heroic in the discharge of their ordinary duties and in their adherence to the line of honorable conduct. No doubt honest and efficient leadership would work a wonderful change for the better in the morale of the Force.

Now, what does all this mean—what does it imply?

Here, in the era in which the Nation steps out into the world's affairs full of the enthusiastic purpose of being a mighty factor for progress, right and justice, when all eyes are scanning the nation and looking for its real principles and purposes, a rotten police administration, despised and feared by the people, is held up to the eyes of the world in the world's second city—the metropolis of North America!

Worse than that! While all know and admit the facts, all too faintly portrayed above, there is grave doubt whether the people will reverse the present order of things, and the upholders of the corrupt system are proceeding boldly in the belief that the people will not. That is their plan of campaign. These men are not novices; they are trained in observation and deduction and they are working for their pockets, not for sentiment.

What is the basis of their belief and hope? It is that the people have become used to corruption; that they like it, as the high liver enjoys tainted meat. It is that manhood and citizenship generally in New York City have become so debased

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by contact with vile things that for the chance of securing political jobs, of getting little shares of dirty money, of "doing business" with thrifty law-breakers, of securing the favor of the all-powerful cabal that controls things and of avoiding its enmity a majority of the voters of the city will elect deliberately to continue this carnival of nasty corruption. Is there not a practical foundation for this belief—a practical reason for this course of political action? A poor but talented young lawyer came to New York. Finding that Tammany was entrenched in power, he revised the principles and the teachings of his life and home and joined with Tammany, saying that he had not come to New York for sentiment but for success. He swallowed everything that came along. To-day he is a wealthy and successful corporation lawyer.

Another came privately and gave valuable information against certain officials, but begged secrecy because his business prospects were all locked up in apparent fidelity to The Organization.

What these lawyers have done hundreds of others are doing, and judges have found their way to the bench by suing and paying for their nominations and by grovelling at the feet of men whom they despised in their hearts.

These illustrations are typical, and they might be extended into almost every important avocation. What, then, shall we expect of the poor and the ignorant man? Let us see just what does happen.

A youth goes into a licensed dive. He watches and listens to a disgustingly licentious performance. No policeman interferes with it; on the contrary, the police have reported favorably on it and have licensed it. There he meets veterans of the other sex. There is no appearance of shame, none of fear. He plunges into the whirlpool and becomes a frequenter of disorderly houses. Perhaps he is making money by trapping and selling girls. He is a direct product of the police system, and the stream of evil started in him and in a thousand others like him is not easily or perhaps ever completely stopped.

Or the young man finds his way into one of the poolrooms or gambling rooms kept by the friends or the rulers of the police. It is a part of the established and orthodox New York system. Speedily he becomes a confirmed gambler. Perhaps he robs his employer to play the races. He resents the interference of out-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siders with his pastime. *He learns contempt of the law from the very guardians of the law.* It has no longer majesty for him.

To the young woman many downward roads are open, and the policemen stand by not to close them but to make them easy.

The newly arrived immigrant was an honest man at home. He comes to a new and strange land and expects to fall into the customs of that land. He peddles; but he must pay the police. If he refuses or acts on some old-fashioned principle of righteousness, he is abused, arrested, perhaps clubbed. He opens a little store. His neighbor keeps open on Sunday because he pays for the privilege; so does he likewise. He sees his neighbors keeping disorderly houses and getting immunity by paying the police, who by the payment are transformed from prosecutors to protectors. He says: This is, indeed, a strange country, but as the uniformed officers of the law accept money and permit the business it must be right. He yields to the temptation and he, too, opens a disorderly house. If it succeeds, he develops a fine contempt for the law and for decency. He becomes a bad citizen, and enters into other lawbreaking conspiracies. If he fails or is bled and destroyed by the police, he becomes, perhaps, an anarchist.

To a majority of the people of this city the bluecoated policeman stands as the full representative of the city, the nation, the Constitution. He is the only official power and authority that they know, unless it be the police justice. If these policemen be notoriously corrupt, immoral, brutal, what becomes of respect for the law and respect for the nation? The immense growth of anarchism on the East Side is due largely to the conduct of the police. What of the children going to school, who must on the way learn lessons of vice and crime from protected houses and criminals, who see the guilty and the infamous prosper while "justice" leers and winks for bribes! How can we expect from them steady and steadfast devotion to truth and honor, a respect for law, and a moral movement to redeem a city? What can we expect when the games of little children go through the forms of buying and selling votes, and when in answer to questions they point inquiring men to the doors of the prostitute?

We may find the same law at work in every walk of life. Young men anxious to succeed in business see on every hand the large wages of truculence, the tangible profits of collusion with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lawbreakers, the power and advantage of connection with the ruling force, though it be as corrupt as hell. It is astounding that the recital of official peculation and debasement to the best audiences is received not with groans and the evidences of indignation, but rather with amusement and laughter. This is not yet true of statements of brutality. The difference is striking!

There is a lurking feeling that it is smart to make money, and that the official is a fool who does not improve his opportunities. It has come from the simple operation of the minds of men as they have watched a guilty Police Department and other departments like it defy the law, and join the lawbreakers, and grow rich, and beat down the prosecutors.

Is it not a great object lesson to young men to see the vicious police captain protecting every known crime for money, shrewdly or boldly defying all attempts to catch him or to prosecute him, moving steadily into higher positions, openly consorting with confessed and notorious violators of the law, obviously neglecting and refusing to enforce the law against these friends or pals; to see those who ultimately profit the most by the system rolling in luxury and wealth, possessing fabulous power, worshipped almost; to see these men violate all the conventional moralities and make a farce and a spectacle of oaths of office and of laws and ordinances; and then to see that the wicked prosper with great prosperity, while those who have the temerity to fight them are abused, mocked and jeered at and suffer in business, in comfort and sometimes in reputation—does this teach good citizenship?

Nay, does it not tend to actual dishonesty? If a dealer in fire hose secures profitable city contracts by dividing his profits with city officials, why should the dealers' clerks hesitate to carry the same successful short cuts into their employers' private business and to corrupt the agents of their other competitors and customers?

It is not realized that the robbery of the treasury is the robbery of every citizen, that the sale of some indulgences opens the way to the sale of others, that by the insidious process now going on we may lose all our real liberties and live in only the shadow, the figment, the shell, the simulcrum of a free and popular government. The process that has been going on in New York, and that already has greatly damaged the civic body and the civic spirit, produces its results not only in the city but it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inevitably affects the other cities of the nation and the whole of the nation.

It is idle to say that the general lowering of official standards coupled with great gains will not be copied in other cities. New York's police-criminal alliance *has* been copied in other cities, and in many such places the same corruption is now at work. The spirit of citizenship in this city will affect all the communities in the land. Everybody comes to New York, or looks to New York, to learn how money is to be made and to copy the methods. If principles of honor and of conduct are loose here, and loose for financial gain, the standards that prevail will be copied.

The great battle for reform in New York is a battle for the nation and there is as much need as there ever was for true patriotism and true heroism.

It is in the cities that the true greatness of the country is to be won or lost, and it is to be won or lost in the essential characteristics of the people. We need a revival of simple patriotism among the common people—a patriotism that reaches to the conscience of the individual, and that puts the honor of the country and of the city above all considerations of selfish gain.

FRANK MOSS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STRENGTH AND WEAKNESS OF TAMMANY HALL.

BY WALTER L. HAWLEY.

THE organization that has so long dominated, demoralized and disgraced municipal government in the city of New York is mistakenly classed as a political faction—the regular form of one of the great political parties of the country. It is true that one of the elements of strength of Tammany has been nominal party regularity and ostentatious adherence to alleged partisan principles, but the mass of its membership know little, and care less, about national questions that are designated as campaign issues. Tammany is essentially a close corporation held together by a carefully adjusted community of selfish interests.

Those persons who would credit one man with a genius of organization to encompass the recent successes of the organization must lose sight of the fact that for almost one hundred years Tammany has never been exterminated and rarely defeated in city elections. No purely political reason will fully explain such a record. While party regularity is an element of strength, the chief sources of its recuperative and enduring powers must be sought for outside of partisan feeling.

Tammany avails itself of all the tricks of partisanship to unite and hold together antagonistic racial, religious and social elements of society, but no party creed in this country has endured for a century; so the real strength of this organization must be looked for beneath the surface of its campaign declarations. Americans proud of the individual liberty assured by their form of government are slow to admit that racial or religious influences exist in politics and public affairs. Tammany exists and dominates the city of New York by skillfully combining, under the creed of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self-interest, race and religious prejudice. This assertion may be denied; it cannot be disproved.

Of the thirty-five district leaders of Tammany, the men who compose the Executive Committee and decree its policy, an average of thirty are Irish Catholics. The others are Germans and Jews. These three elements of the community supply the working membership of the organization, with the Irish dominant in numbers and influence. The real voting strength of Tammany lies in channels of social and religious sentiment that are the basis of collective gratitude and individual self-interest. The Association is organized and in business at all times. It brings the lower strata of society into harmless and harmonious good-fellowship at free entertainments, and knows neither creed nor clan in the distribution of its charities and non-political favors.

In brief, Tammany relies for much of its voting and moral strength upon three elements of human nature—gratitude, avarice and religious sentiment. Those who have accepted its charity and kindly favors feel grateful; those who have learned its methods are hopeful of material reward, if they serve it; and the creeds it sustains are tolerant of its misdeeds. It keeps city government down to the level and the understanding of the majority, hiding the weakness and subterfuge of such methods under banners of alleged protection of the rights of the masses.

This system that so easily blends and binds into one harmonious whole all the antagonistic elements of races, religions, social conditions and political theories is not vicious and corrupt for the mere love of sinning. It will protect vice or promote morality with equal energy and success, if the cash consideration is the same. Tammany has no higher aim, in fact no cause for existence, except to make money for those who compose and control the organization. The control of the city government is merely a means to an end. Power provides opportunity. Therefore Tammany purchases power with the favors of politics. It aids and abets crime because criminals can be made to pay for assistance in cash and can then be frightened into silence. It fawns upon the rich and powerful when proffering the favors that will buy their aid or indifference, and crushes the weak and poor when they cease to yield revenue.

Tammany grows strong and wins with the aid of the greed and selfishness of rich and intelligent citizens, skillfully com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bined with the ignorance and avarice of the poor. Its moral and intellectual standards are kept down to the level of the slums, because the voting strength of the tenement and the mansion are as ten to one. When secure in control of the city and county government, this system has never elected or appointed to an important office a man of great ability or high moral character. Its representatives in Congress and the State Legislature rank with the lowest in capacity and fitness. Its agents in the highest city offices and on the bench have been, as a rule, men who could be trusted to work for the interests of the organization. No man of independent spirit, no man of superior intelligence and honorable record need seek political preferment at the hands of Tammany when it is secure in power. This favoritism of mediocrity is a part of its strength, an important feature of the political policy of the organization.

The system draws an arbitrary line through the registered voters of the city. On one side of that line it places the criminals, the vicious, the unscrupulous, the poor, the partially educated and the ignorant. On the other side are placed the men of property, education and refinement, and those willing to barter money or influence for special favors of politics and government. The divisions may be classified as the taxpayers and the non-taxpayers. The latter outnumber the substantial citizens ten to one, and from the larger division come the votes that keep Tammany in power. Seven-tenths of the men on one side of the line are constantly seeking office, city employment, political preference, protection for vice and crime, or some material favor from the ruling power that will give them advantage over competition in business or professional work. Tammany strives to favor the multitudes; therefore, the moral and intellectual tone of local government is kept down to the level of the masses.

Good breeding and education do not always constitute absolute disqualification for holding office under Tammany, but there is one requirement that is essential—the applicant must be worth something to the organization in money, votes or influence. He must pay a fixed sum in cash for the nomination or appointment, must be able to deliver on election day a certain number of votes of relatives or friends, or through his social, church or society connection he must be able to exercise a certain amount of influence that will be useful in time of need. This system of elec-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, appointment and advancement is followed to the letter. Governing a city is a matter of business, according to the Tammany creed. The voters deliver the offices and all the power of administration into the hands of the organization. Those offices and the power to protect and to punish are for the time being the goods and chattels of Tammany to be sold to the highest bidder. It is the commerce of politics, and those who follow the trade must thrive. There are men in Tammany whose personal honesty outside of politics has never been questioned. If their moral sense is blunted, it is because of the false teaching of a criminal system. They can grant favors. What is the wrong, they ask, of accepting favors in return? The bill goes to the taxpayers in the end.

Antagonism to civil service or any other system of requiring intellectual and educational fitness for public service is a part of the Tammany policy that goes with the plan of picking out men who may control votes. During campaigns the orators of the organization rail against "Reformers" and civil service to good purpose. In the tenement districts they tell the young men that if "Reformers" got control of the city only college graduates could obtain public office. They make this lie plausible and prove the friendship of Tammany for the poor and ignorant by appointing to important offices men who are uneducated and unfit. To the half-taught, narrow-minded young generation just out of the public schools there is no lesson of debased government and indifferent public opinion so convincing as the one they see around them day after day. When they see at the head of great departments of the city government men who a few years ago were "Mike, the butcher," and "Jim of the liquor store on the corner," the example does not stimulate them to strive for the learning of books or the refinements of higher life. Such examples exist; not a few isolated cases, but many, where great public improvements, grave questions of public policy for the present and the future are in the hands of Tammany's recruits from the butcher shop, the brewery wagon and the saloon. These men promise the ideal government of the people by Tammany for Tammany. They keep the tone of the public service down to the big crowd across the dividing line, and the young voter, weak and ignorant rather than vicious, the criminal ready to pay a royalty from the profits of crime, and the loafer who shuns honest labor, all know that such is the government that has always existed and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

always will exist under the system that is Tammany, and that it cannot exist under any other system. They ask no other reason, no greater inducement to vote the Tammany ticket.

The strength of Tammany is the strength of brute force and animal cunning combined, but it is strength that the good citizen who seeks better government can neither ignore nor despise. It must be met and overcome, and the real fight must be fought out in the arena, down in the slums where the Tiger was trained.

A change of leaders could not change the system. Men of property are willing to pay for special privileges and exemptions for the benefit of their private business. When in control of the city government Tammany has such favors to sell and sells them. It is the commerce of politics. Crime is always willing to share profits with a power that can make crime safe. That power is Tammany. For the voting rabble offices are created, or employment provided. Places with good pay and no work are powerful factors in building up and sustaining a political organization. The city departments are honeycombed with sinecures. One or two more places can always be provided, if the political pressure is strong enough or the cash consideration adequate. Ten thousand employees of the city of New York at the present time could be dropped from the pay-roll in a day and the public service would be benefited rather than crippled. The ten thousand surplus men are Tammany workers and voters. They know that they would soon be out of employment under honest and businesslike government; therefore they are for Tammany. This system of blackmail, favoritism, ignorance, brutality and barefaced robbery of the taxpayers holds fast to itself the ignorant, the vicious and the criminal. There lies the chief voting strength of Tammany.

The weakness of Tammany, like its strength, lies in the unchangeable characteristics of human nature. Its chief bond of cohesion is human selfishness or greed, and no other tie is so easily broken. It is never disinterested; never grateful. When the units of its strength weaken they are cast out. It is loyal to no leader, faithful to no man, beyond the stage of intense self-interest. Its party loyalty is a pretense; its devotion to principles a sham.

Three-fourths of the votes that sustain Tammany are the ballots of real or imaginary self-interest, the votes of men who have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

received or expect material reward in one form or another. The other fourth are contributed by men who are sentimentally attached to the party creed and name under which Tammany masquerades. A growth of intelligent citizenship to the stage that will enable the masses to realize that their material interests will be best served by better city government will defeat Tammany and destroy it. The system has nothing to offer beyond the transient rewards of debased politics. It is a fungus growth on imperfect social and political conditions that will decay and die in the light of universal intelligence.

WALTER L. HAWLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EGYPTIAN PUBLIC DEBT.

BY CLINTON E. DAWKINS, FORMER UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FINANCE IN EGYPT.

It might be contended that an element of romance attaches in most countries to the annals of National Debts, in respect of the struggles and vicissitudes to which they relate, but in Egypt, a land where Finance spells Politics, the story of the Public Debt is pre-eminently romantic. Recklessly and prodigally contracted, that debt for years pressed with crushing severity upon the docile Egyptian peasantry, but the astonishing feature of its history is that, in the end, out of evil came good. The Public Debt, with its associations of grinding taxation and of the koorbash was destined itself to become the salvation of the fellaheen. Foreign intervention in the interest of the creditors brought with it the foreign control which has secured the Egyptian peasantry better conditions of life than they have enjoyed for centuries, possibly better conditions for the mass of the people than have ever been known on the Nile. Reform in Egypt grew out of the necessity of protecting the labor of the fellaheen and of securing them such immunity from extortion and maltreatment that the fruit of their toil would suffice to meet the obligations imposed upon them without their knowledge and without their assent. And this proposition stands, although it is true that foreign intervention has bound the burthen of debt tightly upon Egypt, whereas other countries, it is argued, if placed in similar circumstances, would have repudiated their obligations and proceeded after long years of haggling to some illusory compromise with an exhausted creditor. This was not possible in Egypt; the cause of the foreign creditors was espoused by the most powerful Governments of the Old World, and the irresistible voice of Europe insisted on full measure being paid.

All this must be admitted, and the action of Europe may be criticised. But no repudiation, however thorough, would have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compensated the Egyptian people for the continuance of despotic misgovernment and official torture and exaction, which was the alternative before them. The necessity of securing the interest on the foreign debt involved the termination of an era of frightful misgovernment and allowed the real inhabitants of Egypt, the fellaheen, to raise their heads at last.

To trace the origin of the Egyptian Public Debt we must cast a brief glance at the modern history of the country and at its physical conditions.

Egypt emerges into modern history at the touch of Napoleon and under the auspices of that "barbarian of genius," Mehemet Ali. For centuries, after the closing of the old caravan routes from the East and the circumnavigation of the Cape, Egypt ceased to be of political interest to Europe. Resuscitating, it is more than probable, but turning to another purpose, a project suggested to Louis XIV. by the philosopher Leibnitz, Napoleon suddenly brought Egypt back into the sphere of politics by seizing it as his vantage ground for attacking India. Napoleon failed; but he had revealed the strategic possibilities of Egypt, and that country could no longer be disregarded by England or by France. Mehemet Ali, with his ambitious bid for a great Syrian Empire, did not fail to force Egypt still more prominently upon European statesmen. The organized government which he established on the ruins of the Mamelukes, his passion for introducing into Egypt all the newest appliances and inventions of Europe, invited still further attention. And before long the invention of railways and steamships and the progress of engineering brought within practical range Leibnitz's idea of re-directing Eastern trade into the old channel in which the Venetians had once conducted it with such success.

Before Mehemet Ali died, with his last moments occupied by futile dreams of restoring his old ally Louis Philippe, the overland route was an accomplished fact, and the question was actively discussed whether it should be perfected by railways or by the traditional method in Egypt, the excavation of a canal.

It was out of the ordinary though crushing taxation of the country, enforced by the relentless koorbash, that Mehemet Ali provided for the improvements he introduced. But more gigantic schemes of public works and improvements clearly could not be met by the unaided exertions of the tax-gatherer, and to prose-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cute them the accumulated savings of Europe had to be drawn upon. Moreover, as the vista of material prosperity was opened up the unchecked imagination of the rulers of a most patient, long-suffering people was intoxicated by dreams of personal magnificence and aggrandizement. The beginnings of the Public Debt in Egypt are not to be traced, as in so many countries, to costly wars. Mehemet Ali paid for his great wars, and left no debt behind him. Personal extravagance in later rulers and ambitious programmes of public works led to borrowing; and in a country, and in an epoch, when the rulers treated the whole country as their private estate until gradually forced under external pressure to distinguish between their individual property and the public resources, it was by no means easy to separate what was dissipated by the Palace from other expenditure. But it may be at once roundly stated, though the subject will be touched on again later on, that the greater part of the money borrowed by Said and Ismail Pashas was squandered by them, or stolen from them, with no benefit whatsoever to the country as a whole.

Said Pasha, genial, expansive and autocratic, was the first ruler to be fascinated by ideas of the material development of Egypt, and to launch into a wild personal extravagance foreign to the dispositions of Mehemet Ali and of Abbas. There was much to encourage him.

Owing to the American civil war, the price of Egyptian cotton had risen with startling rapidity, bringing unimagined wealth to the Pashas, while Said was dazzled by the glowing prospects of wealth and importance with which De Lesseps tempted him to grant the Suez Canal concession. Said granted the concession. Moreover, he pledged himself to supply fellaheen diggers to the enterprise (in other words the corvée was to be put at the service of what de Lesseps described as his humanitarian objects), and the Pasha further subscribed for 177,642 founders' shares. Said did not live to pay up his subscription. But his personal extravagance obliged him before his death to raise a loan. The nominal amount was £3,292,800, and the loan was issued by Messrs. Fruhling and Goschen. The rate of interest was 7 per cent., with a sinking fund of 1 per cent., and the net proceeds of the loan to Said were about £2,640,000.

Said Pasha's death in 1863 brought the great Arch-Borrower,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ismail, on the scene. Entering upon his viceroyalty with every profession of liberal ideas and of good government on his lips, Ismail at once took up his predecessor's engagement to the Suez Canal Company, and arranged to complete the payment of the £2,080,000. But there was also other expenditure to be met. Investiture of a new Viceroy at Constantinople was then the rule, and Ismail, already bent upon enlarging his title and prerogatives, had laid out money freely on the Bosphorus in conciliating the Sultan and in securing adherents. Abdul Aziz, moreover, on his side had found his new Viceroy's attentions so profitable that he at once returned the visit, and was gratified by an offering of £100,000 in return for his imperial courtesy.

The floating debt which Said had left behind him, as well as the first loan, now began to assume unmanageable proportions, and Ismail turned to the quarter whence his predecessor had derived assistance. The second Egyptian loan was also issued by Messrs. Fruhling and Goschen. But the terms this time were stiffer. Interest, as before, was to run at 7 per cent., but a 4 per cent. sinking fund took the place of the old 1 per cent. sinking fund. The nominal amount of the loan was £5,704,200; the amount encashed by the Viceroy was £4,864,000.

That same year, however, was distinguished by an incident which at once committed Ismail to further borrowing and paved the road to eventual insolvency. The Suez Canal undertaking had run a chequered course. In 1856 the charter had been granted; the canal was to have been completed in 1864. But in 1864 the canal was very far from finished and the enterprise was in dire straits. The Sultan had interfered, objecting to the alienation of territory involved in the land grant, and though the operations of de Lesseps had not been arrested by the Suzerain's scruples, the Egyptian Government found itself obliged to resume the greater part of the land grant to satisfy the Porte. The ceded strip was narrowed to 200 metres on either bank, but the Egyptian Government was to give reasonable compensation for the shrinkage. Again, the Viceroy, so it was alleged, had been unpunctual in his supplies of forced labor. The company, therefore, caught at the chance of securing fresh funds to continue its work, for it was to all intents and purposes bankrupt, by magnifying and pressing its claims on the Viceroy, while excusing its own *lâches*. It found a powerful ally.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A settlement of these charges and counter charges had become necessary, and the whole matter had been referred to the arbitration of Napoleon III., de Lesseps having a warm partisan and supporter in the person of the Empress.

The Emperor delivered sentence in July, 1864, and history probably records few more inequitable, if not iniquitous, awards.

The company obtained an indemnity of £3,360,000, of which £1,520,000 was given on account of the irregular supply of forced labor, while the resumption of land into which Ismail had been forced by the Sultan was atoned for by the monstrous payment of £1,200,000, and £640,000 was paid for taking over the fresh-water canal from Ismailia to Suez.

Worst of all, Ismail acquired the habit of supplying funds to the canal. In 1866 the company retroceded another piece of land. Ismail bought back the Wadi Tumilat for £300,000, which the company had acquired for £74,000. But this was an unimportant item. From first to last Egypt contributed according to the usually accepted calculation, £16,000,000 in terms of money toward the canal. According to de Lessps' figures the assistance amounted to £10,000,000. From this contribution may be deducted the £4,000,000, in round figures, paid by Lord Beaconsfield for the shares subsequently purchased by the British Government. But there were other indirect and far-reaching sacrifices made by Egypt. The productive powers of the country were seriously restricted by the diversion of thousands of the fellaheen each year from agricultural operations. Dragged away from his beloved "beled" under the blows of the koorbash the fellah was condemned to scoop up the sand in baskets to make the great trench through the desert, while agricultural land went out of cultivation. No loan was raised specially and exclusively by the Viceroy to finance the canal, but the floating debt created to discharge the obligations he had incurred or accepted drove Ismail headlong forward along his dangerous path. Borrowing was not long deferred, under these circumstances, but this time Ismail went through a new form of borrowing by pledging his private estate or Daira, and began the series of Daira loans. As there was no distinction between the public revenues of the country and the private income of the Viceroy (and we shall see that subsequently the Daira loans were assimilated to the direct state loans), borrowing on the security of the Daira amounted to an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ingenious method of varying one and the same pledge, with this advantage to the lender that he insisted on a somewhat higher rate of interest in view of a pretended difference in the security.

The first Daira loan of 1865 was negotiated by the Anglo-Egyptian Bank. Terms were becoming still stiffer. The loan, with a nominal capital of £3,000,000, was issued at 90; the rate of interest was 9 per cent., with a sinking fund of 3.27 per cent. One of the objects of the loan was to pay for the estate of Halim Pasha, a surviving son of Mehemet Ali, who had been forced to consent to sell at a price of £1,000,000. Next year Ismail shifted back again to his previous method, and a loan secured on the public revenue was announced. The so-called Railways loan of 1866 was a monument of extravagant finance. The nominal amount of the loan was again £3,000,000 at 7 per cent. The amount received was £2,640,000. By way of a sinking fund it was arranged that the £3,000,000 should be repaid (and it was so repaid) by six annual installments of £500,000, a rate equivalent to a sinking fund of 18.9 per cent., constituting, therefore, during six years an average charge of over 26 per cent. on the amount actually realized. In another twelvemonth the Viceroy who had feed the Porte heavily to concede him the somewhat meaningless title of Khedive, and had paid costly visits to London, Paris and Constantinople, harked back again to the Daira system of borrowing. Ismail was, indeed, badly in want of ready cash; Treasury bonds of all kinds had been issued, but they were taken at ruinous prices, and the market was gorged. Another forced sale of property had contributed to the situation. Besides buying the title of Khedive, the ruler of Egypt, desperately anxious to establish a regal dynasty, had induced the Porte to alter the law of succession and to vest the succession in the eldest son of the Khedive instead of the eldest surviving male of Mehemet Ali's family. Prince Halim, the original heir under the old law, had already been bought out, and it had seemed expedient to apply the same process again to Mustapha Fazil, the Khedive's younger brother. The second Daira loan, and fourth of Ismail's loans, was nominally brought out by the Imperial Ottoman Bank. The Mustapha Pasha loan of 1867 was for £2,080,000, interest at 9 per cent., plus a sinking fund of 3.4 per cent. It was issued at 90 per cent., but as payment was allowed in discredited floating debt bonds received at par the actual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amount received did not furnish Ismail's coffers very amply. The floating debt, after the operation, still remained at some figure between £25,000,000 and £30,000,000, while the total revenue of the country was at this time about £6,000,000. The Treasury bills were circulating at a discount of 16 per cent., while Daira bills were discounted at 22 per cent. Such a situation obviously demanded still more heroic measures, and more heroic measures were forthcoming. A forced national loan was attempted, but proved abortive. A grand state loan for £11,890,000 negotiated by the Oppenheims was the remedy; it was issued in 1868 to provide for public works, to pay off indebtedness to the Suez Canal, and to meet maturing bonds of the public debt. The issue price was 75, and the loan bore interest at 7 per cent., with a sinking fund of 1 per cent. Commission charges were also heavy, and the net amount received by the Treasury, partly, as before, in discredited bonds, was £7,193,000; the rate, therefore, paid on the amount realized was 13¼ per cent. This grand transaction was the prelude to an outburst of extravagance. For months Cairo lived in full carnival, and the Opera House (built mainly by forced labor) was at last opened. New taxes were at the same time piled on and exacted and over-exacted with the utmost rigor. A usual procedure was for a money lender to take with him chests of hard cash and accompany the tax collector in his tours in the provinces. Called upon to pay their taxes before the crops were ripe, the villagers, under the stimulus of the koorbash, were then and there obliged to borrow from the attendant Shylock and to assign their coming crops to him in payment. But nothing could stay the rising tide of expenditure. In 1869 the Suez Canal was at last opened. The festivities cost over £1,000,000. At the same time, in order to conciliate philanthropic sentiment in England, Sir Samuel Baker was dispatched on an expedition to suppress the slave trading on the White Nile, an enterprise which accounted for £500,000, and made the Soudan a drain upon Egypt. Further difficulties with the Suez Canal Company were also settled for £1,240,000 and the coupons of the Egyptian shares were assigned for the payment. Still more heroic measures were now clearly necessary to put the Khedive in possession of funds, but for the moment the Khedive dared not again pledge the public revenues. He had, indeed, undertaken when raising the loan for £11,890,000 in 1868 not to borrow again for five

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

years, but this did not prevent him once more having recourse to a Daira loan, the third and last. It was necessarily a tamer operation.

The Daira loan of 1870, arranged by Messrs. Bischoffsheim, was only for £7,142,860 at 7 per cent., with a sinking fund of 2.35 per cent., amounting together to a charge of nearly 13½ per cent. on the amount actually realized of £5,000,000. Side by side with this came an internal forced loan known as the Monkabalah or "compensation" loan. Land owners were pressed to pay six years' land tax in advance and in "compensation" the tax was to be reduced thereafter by 50 per cent. With much squeezing this precious expedient brought in about £8,000,000. When Egypt's house was finally set in order, owners of land who had subscribed were indemnified by an annuity of £153,750, payable for a term of fifty years. This repayment constitutes Egypt's internal debt.

But the curtain was now rung up for the climax of the financial tragi-comedy. In 1873 Ismail was once more free to pledge the credit, such as it was, of the country, and an excuse was to hand in the desirability of effecting a great economy by converting the floating into a funded debt. The floating debt was about £28,000,000 and carried an average rate of interest of 14 per cent. It was first proposed to raise a loan of £20,000,000, then of £26,000,000, and, finally, that nothing should be left out, the colossal sum of £32,000,000 was settled for the new loan. Messrs. Oppenheim negotiated the great operation. Everything in Egypt of the nature of a public asset that remained unpledged was now pledged, and in addition all revenues already assigned were mortgaged as soon as they should be released. The rate of interest was 7 per cent., with a sinking fund of 1 per cent., but subscription in part was allowed in Treasury bonds, and the amount realized by the Egyptian Treasury was about £20,740,000, the real charge for interest and sinking fund together on the net proceeds working out at 12.36 per cent. This great stroke, however, did not quite conclude Ismail's operations. The very next year, 1874, he managed to raise £3,000,000 for a twelvemonth from the Anglo-Egyptian Bank, a sum on which he paid 14 per cent. A year later saw him surrendering the 177,642 shares in the Suez Canal, originally subscribed for by Said Pasha, to the British Government in exchange for £4,000,000. As the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

coupons had been detached up to 1894, and as Ismail received £450,000 more than had been paid for the shares, the bargain was the best he had ever made. And as the shares are now worth £24,000,000, and the revenue they will bring in this year is estimated at £850,000, Lord Beaconsfield's bargain for Great Britain has turned out one of the best ever made for any country.

At this point we may take leave of Ismail as a borrower. It is true that he remained Khedive till 1879, but after 1876 until his abdication the financial destinies of Egypt and the fortunes of its public debt passed under international control. In 1876 Messrs. Goschen and Joubert, strongly supported by the Governments of Great Britain and France, proceeded to Egypt on behalf of the bondholders, who were menaced by sheer inability on the part of Egypt to pay their interest. The result of their recommendations was embodied in Khedivial decrees in 1876 and in 1877, dividing the outstanding loans into four classes. The so-called State loans of 1862, 1868 and 1873 were split up between a United Debt of £59,000,000 bearing 6 per cent. interest with a further 1 per cent. as Sinking Fund; the remainder of these debts received priority as a Privileged Loan of £17,000,000, carrying 5 per cent. The loan of 1864 was treated together with the two Daira loans of 1865 and 1867, making a total amount of £4,392,616, on the various portions of which rates of interest of nearly 11, 12 and 12¼ per cent. were fixed. The Daira loan of 1870 and the Floating Debt were amalgamated into a third loan of £8,815,000 at 5 per cent. interest. The total of the whole debt was fixed at £89,208,000, and Egypt was called upon to bear a total debt charge of £6,565,000. Two controllers-general, an Englishman and a Frenchman, were appointed, and an International Caisse of four members, English, French, Austrian and Italian, was constituted to receive the interest for the bondholders. But the recommendations made by Messrs. Goschen and Joubert were made upon imperfect information. Facts had been misrepresented to them, and other facts had been concealed. The koorbash had been applied unmercifully in the preceding years to extract revenue out of Egypt. What flogging and torture had extracted it is impossible to estimate exactly. But the revenue of the country was officially estimated by the foreign consuls-general at between £9,000,000 and £9,500,000. It was impossible for Egypt to support a charge on her foreign debt that amounted to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over two-thirds of the revenue, and, with the tribute of Turkey added, ran up to over £7,000,000. The only possible method of meeting the coupons was by continually collecting the taxes ahead, and by subjecting the broken peasantry to ever increasing extortion. It was clear that this could not go on; and a partial failure of the Nile flood in 1877, bringing famine in its train, threatened inevitable collapse and repudiation. A searching commission of inquiry into both the revenue and expenditure of the Court, and into the entire fiscal and administrative machinery, was imperative. Ismail was forced to assent. In 1879 the truth was at last laid bare and the Commission agreed that the sources of all extravagance and confusion was the Khedive himself and that as long as Ismail retained his arbitrary power improvement and economy were impossible. Ismail bowed before the storm of public opinion; but with a fixed determination to escape from the restrictions placed upon him and to regain full financial liberty. He accepted the principle of Ministerial responsibility. The progressive and enlightened Armenian Christian, Nubar Pasha, was put at the head of the Ministry, and an Englishman and a Frenchman, Sir Rivers Wilson and M. de Blignières, were entrusted with the portfolios of Finance and of Public Works. This high comedy had a short run. Ismail at once set about inciting a movement among the fanatical elements of the population and the native officers, who were in arrears of pay, against the new Ministry. It was his design to prove to Europe that Mahommedan sentiment would not tolerate a Ministry containing Christians, and that the Khedive's arbitrary power could alone repress disorder in Egypt. A riot directed against the Ministers broke out, and Ismail appeared and suppressed it. But Europe had taken his measure, and the representatives of the Great Powers advised him to abdicate. For a moment the Khedive seemed prepared to defy them, and coercion would have involved many awkward questions. But his nerve failed him, and in June, 1879, he shuffled ingloriously off the stage to die an exile. He had succeeded during his rule in piling up a debt of over £66,000,000, contracted in seven regular loans, excluding the Domains loan, to which attention will presently be drawn. How far the money borrowed was wasted; what proportion was spent for the good of the country, it is impossible to discover. Such was the chaos of accounts! "I doubt my-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self," wrote Sir Alfred Milner in "England in Egypt," "whether the portion of Ismail's loans devoted to work of public utility—always excluding the Suez Canal—was equal to 10 per cent. of the amount of debt which he had contracted."

For this nominal debt for which he rendered Egypt liable, Ismail had received perhaps £41,000,000, and he had probably repaid in interest and sinking funds as much as £30,000,000. But, side by side with repayment, he had continually added to an unmanageable floating debt, and so contrived to swell the total unpaid balance of indebtedness.

Ismail's retirement was the prelude to a second recasting of the whole debt under European control, an operation carried out this time with fuller knowledge of all the circumstances.

A preliminary step toward this had been taken during his last days, rendered inevitable by the special and crying difficulty of the Floating Debt. In order to deal with this the European controllers and "Christian Ministry" had induced Ismail to surrender 435,000 acres of his private estates as security for a loan of £8,500,000 to be devoted to liquidating floating obligations. Yet in spite of the assistance of the Rothschilds this loan, which is known as the Domains Loan, though it was issued on the same kind of security as the previous Daira loans, was only issued with an interest of 7 per cent. at 73. The net result, therefore, came to some £6,276,000: and as £1,250,000 was assigned to the November Coupon of the previous debt and a further £500,000 to the tribute due to the Porte, the balance that could be utilized for liquidating the Floating Debt was not too considerable, and this Floating Debt had still to be taken into account in the great rearrangement sanctioned by the Law of Liquidation of July 17th, 1880, to which the Great Powers became a party. The Law of Liquidation followed the same lines as the Goschen-Joubert settlement of four years previously, but it was framed, as has been stated, with fuller knowledge of the resources and needs of the country. The Floating Debt was at last extinguished and the principle of consolidating the various loans into a few great loans was carried still further, while the interest was reduced to an amount the country might possibly pay without incurring fresh debt to discharge the recurring coupons. Yet, even with these reductions, Egypt was called upon to devote nearly half of its total revenue, then about £9,000,000, to the service of the debt,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while taxation, though the actual collection of taxes was regularized and rendered less oppressive, bore very severely on the impoverished population.

The two subjoined tables will show the progress made with the debt between 1876 and 1880:

DEBT AS FIXED ACCORDING TO THE PROPOSALS OF MESSRS. GOSCHEN AND JOUBERT IN 1876 AND 1877.

	Nominal Capital.	Rate of Interest.	Interest.	Sinking Fund.	Total Charge.
Unified debt	£59,000,000	7 per cent.	£3,540,000	£637,700	£4,177,700
Privileged debt	17,000,000	5 per cent.	850,000	35,744	885,744
Loans of 1864, 1865, 1867	4,392,616	10.87 " / 12.27 " / 12.4 "	317,295	743,515	1,060,808
Daira	8,315,430	5 per cent.	440,771		440,771
Total	£89,208,046		£5,148,066	£1,416,957	£6,565,023

LAW OF LIQUIDATION 17TH JULY, 1880.

Unified	£58,018,240	4 per cent.	£2,320,729		£2,320,729
Privileged	22,629,800	5 per cent.	1,131,440	£55,914	1,187,404
Daira	9,386,750	4 per cent.	375,470		375,470
Domains	8,500,000	5 per cent.	425,000		425,000
Total	£98,559,790		£4,252,689	£55,914	£4,308,603

It will be seen that the Unified Debt had been reduced in the four years by redemption. The Privileged Debt was increased by a further issue in order to pay off the Floating Debt, an operation for which the Domains Loan had not sufficed, while other loans were thrown together with the old Daira loan. But the total debt was made more tolerable by the reduction of the rate of interest and by the suspension of various sinking funds, notably by a reduction from 7 to 4 per cent. in the interest on the Unified Debt. The principal of the debt was, indeed, increased, but the total annual charge on Egypt was reduced from £6,565,-023 to £4,308,603.

The task before Egypt, therefore, of paying its way, hard as it was (and it was still very hard), had been rendered practicable. Success seemed assured and the service of the debt was maintained while even the capital was reduced by a million in the next two years. The door appeared closed against further borrowings. But the door was to be pushed open again by various necessities, political and administrative. The European control exercised through the English and French condominium under which the country had passed on Ismail's abdication was fated to receive rude shocks, and was destined to an early dissolution.

Ismail had sown the seeds of trouble. In inciting the Egyp-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tian officers to break out against the Nubar Ministry, he had taught them a lesson they had learnt too well. Certain revenues, the receipts of the railways, telegraphs and of the Port of Alexandria, together with the customs receipts and revenues of the four richest provinces, had been entirely assigned to the Debt. Hard retrenchment was necessary, if the £4,500,000 or so of revenue remaining to Egypt was to suffice, and retrenchment in the army was an obvious economy.

But the military officers, while protesting against retrenchment in their case, had also a special grievance. The Khedivial dynasty, foreign in its origin, had always reserved the higher posts in the army for Turks and Circassians. The military prestige of the Turks, however, had been impaired by the Russo-Turkish war, and the growing feeling of "Egypt for the Egyptians" led the Egyptian-born officers to demand admission to the higher posts. Side by side with this movement another manifestation of national feeling was making itself felt. The new Mixed Tribunals, owning jurisdiction in civil cases between foreigners and natives, had suddenly confronted the impoverished and indebted fellaheen with the summary processes of eviction, a thing practically unknown in a Mahommedan country, where interest is not recognized by Mahommedan law or sentiment, and the recovery of a debt is settled by a long process of haggling. Widespread misery and dismay lent force to what had, in its inception, some promise of being a serious national movement, with demands for reforms inscribed upon its banner, many of which have since been carried out. The two movements—military and national—at first regarded each other with no friendly eye. But the policy of the condominium was neither decided nor sincerely united, and gave rise to many false hopes and illusions. When at last, in 1881, England and France joined in Gambetta's famous Identic Note, threatening foreign intervention, an appeal was made to the fanatical prejudices of the people, and the two Egyptian parties rapidly drew together, while the guidance of the agitation passed to the more violent elements in the country. The result is well known. Foreign intervention became inevitable. France held back, the dominant sea power in the Mediterranean was forced to act, and the control and regeneration of Egypt devolved upon a reluctant, and at first half-hearted, England.

Arabi's rebellion had made Egypt in the meantime liable for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the losses incurred by foreigners when the retiring Egyptian troops set Alexandria on fire. Moreover, as a measure of sheer necessity in order to enable Egypt to pay her way, and to avoid plunging Europe once more into international complications, it had been decided to abandon the Soudan to the forces of Mahdism, and further claims for indemnities arose as a consequence of this bitter necessity. A new loan to pay off all these new obligations was necessary. And it was equally necessary to readjust the distribution of the revenue between the bondholders and the Government Under the law of liquidation the assigned revenues were devoted exclusively to the debt. If these revenues yielded a surplus after the coupons had been paid, that surplus was devoted to the reduction of debt, while, meantime, the unassigned revenues might fall far short of the inevitable needs even of a government conducted with the strictest economy. In 1883, for instance, £800,000 of debt bearing 4 or 5 per cent. interest was discharged, while the governmental expenditure was exceeded by about £1,650,000. In other words, Egypt paid off debt bearing 5 per cent. interest at most with one hand, while with the other she was obliged to contract short loans at higher rates of interest, or else to allow the administrative machinery to get out of gear on the regular working of which the collection of the revenue necessary for the service of the debt depended. The absurdity of the situation was obvious, but the assent of the Great Powers and of Turkey was necessary to any new arrangement, and negotiations were protracted. At length they were concluded, and the Convention of London emerged from out the wilderness of discussion in 1885, superseding and modifying the law of liquidation. That convention remains to this day the organic law, and it is an international law, of Egyptian finance. It dealt with two principal difficulties: the distribution of the revenues between the Government and the bondholders, and the liquidation of the Alexandria and Soudan indemnities.

The first difficulty was dealt with in an extremely ingenious manner. It was imperative not to diminish, and desirable if possible to increase, the security of the bondholders. It was equally imperative not to drive Egypt into piling up fresh obligations at a higher rate of interest while paying off debt bearing a lower rate of interest.

The service of the debt was therefore made the first charge

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the revenues of Egypt. The second charge was a fixed amount appropriated to what was considered the necessary "administrative" expenditure of Egypt. The revenues assigned to the debt were called upon, after providing for its service, to meet, if necessary, any unpaid portion of the administrative budget. Any surplus that might remain over after providing for these first two charges was to be devoted, half to paying off debt or creating a reserve fund for the bondholders; the other half to such administrative purposes as the Government might determine. The "authorized" expenditure of the Government was fixed at £5,370,000, in round figures, one or two items being fluctuating.

But this amount, though sufficient with strict economy for the needs of the Government at the time, has since proved inadequate. The progress of Egypt has therefore depended in a great measure upon the gradual augmentation of the sum appropriated to the authorized expenditure. No addition to the appropriation can be made without the consent of the Powers, or, in other words, without the consent of France, which has viewed with inveterate jealousy any measure that, however it might tend to promote the prosperity of Egypt, may tend at the same time to ensure solvency and to remove to a further distance any prospect of a financial breakdown which would enable France to bring once more before Europe the question of Egypt and of the informal predominance of Great Britain on the Nile. Hence the additions that have been sanctioned to the authorized expenditure (while at the same time the security of the bondholders is being steadily increased by improved administration) have consisted either of items of expenditure such as city drainage, which have chiefly concerned the European residents, or of items such as a contribution to the cost of abolishing the corvée, which the French Government found itself unable to resist without incurring most undesirable political odium in Egypt.

The amount of authorized expenditure now exceeds £6,150,000. But the total administrative expenditure of the Government exceeds this figure by some £400,000. Therefore, in so far as the Government desires to increase expenditure beyond the authorized amount, it can only do so out of its half share in any surplus that may remain over after (1) the service of the debt, and (2) the authorized expenditures have been met. In other words, the Egyptian Finance Department, before meeting any extraordinary

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

need or undertaking any new improvement, has to see that there are two pounds before it can dare to spend twenty shillings.

No doubt this is a check upon extravagance, and would be admirably adapted to curb the extravagances of an Ismail. But, though it may be salutary, it undoubtedly does starve improvement in Egypt under the very different regime now existing.

The liquidation of the Alexandria and Soudan indemnities was an easier matter. Egypt was authorized to raise a loan of £9,000,000, guaranteed by all the Powers, to take precedence of all existing loans. An annuity of £315,000 was provided for the service of the loan, and ranked as the first of all charges upon the revenues assigned to the debt. The loan, ushered in and sponsored after this manner, was a great success. The nominal amount borrowed to obtain exactly £9,000,000 was only £9,424,000, and as the rate of interest was fixed at 3 per cent., the annuity not only provided for the interest, but left a balance over from the beginning to be applied to reduction of the principal. Eight millions of the new loan, the guaranteed loan, as it is called, were applied to paying off the indemnities and the deficits of the last few years, while a million was left over.

The story of this million is one of the most fascinating in the annals of finance. For a country which had ruined itself by borrowing, to borrow yet another million under no compulsion, but while still deeply entangled in a financial slough, seemed on the face of it a last imprudence. Yet the million was borrowed and was devoted to the great need of Egypt, improved irrigation. Nearly one-half of it was devoted to one single work, to completing and rendering practical, under the auspices of Sir Colin Scott Moncrieff, the famous barrage designed by Mongel Bey, to hold up the water of the Nile at its bifurcation below Cairo, instead of allowing the flood to stream uselessly away to the sea, and thereby to raise the water level through all the canals of the Delta and run fertilizing rills into districts which had hitherto lain parched.

How many times this half million has been repaid by the consequent increased prosperity of the country it is impossible to say. In this last year, 1900, but for the barrage, the low Nile would certainly have involved the almost entire loss of the cotton crop of the Delta, Egypt's great staple crop.

From this time forward the history of the Egyptian debt flows in a less troubled stream. Yet it is full of interest, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every detailed event throws light upon the extraordinary political circumstances of the country. In 1887 it was wisely decided, in view of the physical conditions of Egypt, in other words, Egypt's dependence upon an uncertain Nile flood, that it would be more prudent, instead of applying every surplus piastre in the hands of the International Commission of the Debt (increased in number from four to six by the addition of a Russian and German during the negotiations of 1885), to accumulate the money until a reserve fund of £2,050,000—two millions of Egyptian pounds—had been accumulated. As soon as that figure was reached reduction of debt was to be resumed; but power was given to the Commissioners to grant sums out of the reserve fund for "extraordinary expenditure incurred with the previous consent of the Commissioners of the Caisse."

How this simple and prudent provision became a source of international dispute I shall have to recount later on.

The next event in the progress of the debt bears striking evidence to the recovery of Egyptian credit under the auspices of Lord Cromer, the representative of the predominant Power in Egypt. A brilliant page has been added to the history by the extraordinary success of the steady administration and of the conservative reforms conducted under the English occupation in the teeth of much political obstruction, and in the midst of a bewildering maze of international obstacles. In eight short years Egyptian credit rose so high that it became possible in 1890 to convert the privileged debt and to reduce the interest from 5 to 3½ per cent.

Opportunity also was taken at the same time to obtain a further sum of £1,330,000 on easy terms for irrigation and an additional amount was added of £2,330,000 in order to relieve the Egyptian Treasury of certain annual payments made to the Khedivial family. These two items account for the larger part of the increase in the nominal amount of the privileged debt rendered necessary by conversion. The capital of this debt was now raised from £22,296,000 to £29,400,000, but the saving in annual interest was nearly £113,000. At the same time it was found possible to deal with the Daira debt, not in this case by a direct reduction in the rate of interest, but by reducing the capital value of this debt by 15 per cent. The saving in the total annual debt charge consequent upon these operations came to over £320,000 a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

year. It was intended to apply this money to the abolition of the corvée by the substitution of paid labor instead of forced labor for cleaning the canals, the forced labor constituting a severe tax on the poorest inhabitants. But to the astonishment of all the world the consent of France was withheld to so obvious and so just an arrangement. The fellaheen might suffer, but no reform which could be stopped was to be carried out, if it redounded to the prestige and popularity of the English occupation. In the long run, after much discussion and bad feeling, the Egyptian Government achieved its object. France was obliged to consent to an addition of £153,000 to the "authorized expenditure" on account of the corvée. But France insisted, and has persisted in its original refusal. The Conversion Economies, as a result of this refusal, instead of being applied to the reduction of the corvée, and to many other useful reforms, have been passed into a Conversion Economies Fund as a further security for the bondholders. This fund is devoted to the purchase of Egyptian securities; the interest on these securities being again devoted to further purchases of Egyptian stock.

These purchases, which constitute Egypt *pro tanto* the holder of her own debt, operate as a sinking fund. But it is a very expensive and unjustifiable sinking fund forced upon Egypt by the jealousy of France. Egypt, instead of being allowed to draw bonds at par, has to gain control of them by purchases in the open market, and by this system of continual obligatory purchases Egypt forces up the price against herself. In other words, instead of paying £100 to redeem £100 of debt, Egypt has to pay £105 or £106, a figure which may conceivably rise, if the process continues, to £110, or even to £120.

Still another reserve fund remains which must be explained, though its relation to the public debt is not so direct. This is formed out of the free balances which the Egyptian Government may save out of the money coming to it for yearly expenses in the various ways enumerated above. This special reserve fund, as it is termed, amounted on the 31st of December, 1899, to some £250,000.

Here, then, we have the institution of the third of the reserve funds which render any account of Egyptian finance so puzzling. First, as we have seen, there is the general reserve fund, which must amount to £2,050,000 before the unified debt can be paid

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

off, and out of which grants or loans can be made by the Commissioners of the Caisse de la Dette.

At the close of 1899 this fund amounted to £3,600,000 in round figures. This amount, it will at once be observed, exceeds the £2,050,000 to be accumulated before debt is paid off. But as over £1,600,000 has been pledged or assigned as a guarantee for certain public works it is not considered that a free £2,050,000 has been accumlated. This fund is invested in Egyptian securities.

Next there comes the conversion economies fund, which cannot be applied to public objects, but rolls up automatically through the re-investment of the interest accruing on the Egyptian stock in which it is invested. The amount of this fund is over £3,640,000.

Lastly, there is the Government's special reserve fund. The history of the Egyptian debt, however, would not be complete without mention of an incident which, arising out of the international conventions regulating the debt, became a matter of moment in European politics. It grew to be the habit of the Egyptian Government to look with confidence to the general reserve fund for grants or guarantees for public works. The fund is administered by the six international commissioners in a spirit of enlightened regard for Egyptian interests, and no criticism can be passed upon the individual commissioners, who reside in Egypt, although the commission itself is an unnecessarily cumbrous and expensive body. Moreover, another consideration besides their genuine regard for the country has contributed to make the commissioners adopt a liberal attitude in regard to grants for "extraordinary expenditure." The holders of unified bonds are in no hurry, with the bonds standing at 105 or 106, to be paid off at par. This is particularly the case of French holders, who constitute a very large proportion, probably half, of the holders, and who have come to look upon Egyptian unified as a sound family investment. The commissioners fear odium if the general reserve fund exceeds the statutory £2,050,000. Whereas, therefore, in earlier days before the general reserve fund approached two millions the Egyptian Government had to make out a very strong case for a grant of money, the position is now virtually reversed. It is the Caisse which really approaches the Government nowadays to see if some justification of a grant cannot be found to keep the unpledged portion of the fund well within the two millions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Accordingly, when the Egyptian Government determined on the Soudan War in 1896, it naturally had recourse to the Caisse for a grant-in-aid of half a million. The majority of the commissioners acceded, and the money was paid, but the French and Russian commissioners instituted proceedings in the Mixed Courts to compel the Government to restore the money. This procedure opened up a number of serious questions, besides gravely complicating the relations between Great Britain and France.

The Mixed Courts, it was generally held, had no jurisdiction over the Egyptian Government in its acts of sovereignty. Yet the Courts, though avoiding a decision on this large question, entertained and did not reject the suit. The next question was whether grants for military expenditure were or were not capable of inclusion in the extraordinary expenditure for which the Caisse was authorized to make grants. The language of the decree authorizing grants for extraordinary expenditure in no wise excludes grants for military purposes, and therefore the onus of proving that a grant for this purpose could not come within the scope of the decree clearly lay upon the objectors. But the Court, whose proceedings throughout evoked considerable suspicion of partisanship, came to a contrary decision, and eventually ordered the repayment of the money, while discreetly leaving open most of the fundamental issues involved. The Egyptian Government accepted the position, and refunded the money—which was immediately granted to the Egyptian Government by the Government of Great Britain. A curious, and, at one time, rather threatening international episode was in this way brought to a conclusion satisfactory to Great Britain and Egypt, and most unsatisfactory to France, which had provoked it.

Since this episode the Egyptian debt has not reappeared upon the political arena, but its credit has risen continually higher, and Egypt is steadily becoming a larger owner of her own securities.

At the end of 1899 the nominal capital of the Egyptian debt stood at £103,049,000, of which £7,494,000 was in the hands of the Commissioners of Debt, *i. e.*, was held by Egypt. The total amount in the hands of the public was therefore £95,555,000. And the interest charge on the whole debt was £3,862,000.

These figures may with advantage be compared with the figures of the 1877 settlement, and of those given by the law of liquidation:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	Capital of debt in hands of public.	Total debt charge.
1877	£89,208,946	£6,565,023
1880	98,559,790	4,308,603
1899*	95,550,000	3,862,000

A certain amount of these last two loans is paid off every year by the proceeds of sales of portions of the land on which they are mortgaged. But under international conventions the amount of annual redemption is limited, and these loans, as well as the privileged loan, cannot be converted or paid off till 1905.

In that year great changes may be made in the Egyptian debt. An arrangement has been made with a syndicate whereby the unsold Daira estates are to be taken over by the syndicate in that year; the outstanding capital, which is still over £6,165,000, will be cancelled, while, in addition, a certain share in eventual profits from resales of the land is secured to the Egyptian Government. Moreover, the Government will be free to deal with the privileged debt at the same date, and it will be open to Egypt, should it seem fit, to cancel this debt by turning over its railways to a company. Such an operation might pave the way to an eventual conversion of the great unified debt. However, prophesies in such a matter are unwise, but if Egypt maintains anything like her recent rate of progress the existing debt, gigantic as it may seem, might be extinguished soon after the middle of the twentieth century.

Meanwhile, those who are responsible for the welfare of Egypt are again showing their faith in borrowing for reproductive purposes, and a further issue of £1,740,000 of privileged debt has been arranged, which will be devoted to public works or to clearing off advances from the general reserve fund granted for that purpose.

C. E. DAWKINS.

* Note that between 1880 and 1899 it had been necessary to raise the Guaranteed Loan of £9,000,000.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME COMMENTS ON DIVORCE.

BY MRS. KATE GANNETT WELLS.

THAT the "higher criticism" has not materially impugned the authority of the Bible in relation to personal affairs to-day, is evident from the attitude of a large number of people concerning divorce. Logically, those who accept the teachings of the Bible or of the Church as infallible for all time are justified in believing that the canonical cause for divorce is the only one.

To other persons, however, the authority of the Bible is not final in matters of discipline, though they acknowledge that a Church, as an organization, has entire right to prescribe formulas of action for its members, as members, or penalties for their misdemeanors, but not for its members as individuals in the body politic. They even grant that the less authority the State has over religion, the more need is there of personal righteousness and the greater the function of preaching. But interference of Church action founded on doctrinal belief with the rights of the State over its corporate members, as arbiter, is to set up an *imperium in imperio,* and is at best in a country where there is no State church an unrepublican anomaly.

The Biblical prohibition of divorce is no more explicit than the command to give away both coat and cloak, in which charity long ago found a loophole of escape from personal impoverishment. And it was wise Roger Sherman, of the Continental Congress, who contrived to justify the Connecticut law, which then permitted divorce for three years of wilful desertion and neglect of duty, by discovering that the statute was supported by the twenty-fourth article of the Westminster Confession on the testimony of the fifteenth verse of the seventh chapter of First Corinthians, wilful desertion being a case about which "our Lord had not given any direction."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If, however, the authority of the Bible is not to be invoked in support of divorce save for one cause, the reasons for divorce are to be sought either in the good of the individual or of the community, which is a curious mixing of terms since the greater includes the less. Yet it is just this separation of terms that under the guise of a chivalric quest is leading alike to rampant individualism and to paternal legislation. Unfortunately, the sacramental view of wedlock has failed to be its protection, and therefore are there many legal limitations under which marriage is already enjoined, the number of which must shortly be increased, if the State would check the progeny of feeblemindedness.

But coincidently with state regulations concerning marriage has developed also a code of divorce laws that assumes the expediency of divorce, and the question of the validity of that assumption resolves itself into a consideration of the right of the state to annul what it has once sanctioned. Just because the "unto death" clause of the church service is fraught with possibilities of suffering, the state has mercifully taken unto itself the prerogative under certain conditions of undoing what it has done as safer on the whole than the application to marriage of indeterminate sentence concerning its duration.

As sufficient causes usually cited for the intervention of law are infidelity, non-support, "gross neglect of duty" and "extreme cruelty." In regard to the first, the injured party whether man or woman, must keenly feel the personal indignity offered by infidelity, as such a plea for divorce is an open recognition of the basis of marriage which many a woman had rather endure wrong than acknowledge in public.

The second cause, non-support, is being done away with by the modern, economic woman, who contends for her right to industrial pursuits and alleges her ability and destiny to be a wage-earner. It used to be a stigma to be so unattractive as a wife that one was not supported in comfort. Now, it is a greater stigma to be incapable of self-support. If both husband and wife are to be wage-earners, or if the unearned increment of invested capital accrues to both, it will be difficult for a woman to base a suit upon this ground, except its object be to secure an arrangement for her participation in her husband's resources, in which case it is still to be hoped the larger burden of self-support will fall upon the man, once the patron, now the equal, of woman!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The third and fourth conditions, "gross neglect of duty" and "extreme cruelty," appeal to the mind as pregnant phrases, which allow large liberty to offenders and require a nice sense of discrimination in the court. If other conditions are maligned, these can never be—susceptible as they are of individual interpretation, sheltering alike vanity and modesty. "Neglect of duty" is a much more ethical cause than the offering of "indignities" that render life "intolerable" or "burdensome," as one might be over-fastidious or too easily bored. "Extreme cruelty" depends upon that to which the victim has been accustomed. But, however bad or misleading is any "omnibus clause," it is no worse in its moral effect than restriction of divorce to a single cause.

It is acknowledged good form to speak of any one of these four causes (desertion is really included under non-support) in polite society. Yet, if one ventures to hint at other causes, which to a high-minded, sensitive person are quite as galling, society fears it is compromised, and religiosity and morality fear that The Home is to be invaded. There are more crimes committed upon The Home in its name than upon any other holy place. The daily spectacle of a discordant home is worse for a child than the known separation of its parents. It may be—it often is—edifying to see the meekness with which long-continued suffering is endured; but it does not follow that it might not be more instructive to witness a righteous self-protection. What the woman endures cannot be told, while that which the man suffers is more patent and specific in its character.

If a woman, having contracted a union which must be fatal to her purpose to protect the future from evil inheritances, seeks divorce to avoid being the mother of children with criminal or unmoral tendencies or congenital defects, she is said by some to be flying in the face of Providence, or to be forsaking her duty as wife, when her duty to the state as mother is paramount to her duty as individual. Many a brave woman has sought divorce for this publicly unalleged cause, and many more piously reared women would do so if they had not been taught as true doctrine the Biblical assumption of the supremacy of man. Yet the state can more easily afford divorce courts than the support of the infirm, or than having its industrial conditions affected by vacillating will power and an anæmic condition among its citizens.

Between the two extreme positions of a state where no divorce

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is permissible, and the former famous "omnibus clause," which now has been generally repealed, there is a wide range of specific causes, each one in itself legitimate provided the character and intentions of the parties are righteous, which would make the court a judge of what constitutes character over and above specific statutory acts. "Extreme cruelty" usually means grievous bodily injury, but in some States it also includes great mental suffering inflicted by either party to the marriage. Elsewhere it is ruled that "habitual drunkenness" must have been acquired after marriage in order to be alleged as cause for divorce—presumably because no one need marry a drunkard; though it might also be contended that the acquisition of such habit after marriage was due to wedded unhappiness for which one of the parties must have been responsible, and that no divorce should be granted to the end that the guilty might do penance.

The habitual, excessive and intemperate use of opium, morphine and chloral is also admitted as cause for divorce; and in one State at least incurable insanity subsequent to marriage is cause. There is much variation in the States in regard to conviction of felony or infamous crime or imprisonment, as offering legitimate cause for divorce—ranging from temporary incarceration in the penitentiary to imprisonment for life. In some States nothing is said about conviction. Certainly, the most cursory glance at State variation of causes indicates the need for greater uniformity, but yet again such variation—or laxity, if that word is preferred—is better than no divorce, or divorce for "canonical" cause alone.

Such variation, however, affords proof of the different valuations placed upon the "holy estate of matrimony," which when all is said is still a matter of personal values. The woman in an English court who said she would not have minded her husband's cruelty or drunkenness if he had only noticed what she wore, uttered a cry of personality. The craving, not for clothes (albeit hers were of rags) but for personal recognition of something in herself beyond being his cook, was the longing of her soul. Weak or feminine as was such an utterance, it emphasizes the personal character of the marriage relation.

An amusingly personal provision of one State law made it a misdemeanor for a married man "to make proposals of marriage or to represent himself as unmarried," which is here quoted as in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dicative of the difficulties inherent in special paternal legislation of any kind.

Many of the varying statutory causes for divorce may be summed up under the general term of "incompatibility," a word that still carries with it opprobrium, as if it represented the opposite of Platonic affection. Incompatibility is as much a proven fact as any other condition developed by social and moral forces. It may mean much or little. Because it may signify little, shall it cease to be a cause for divorce? Better, say the moralists in the name of The Home, that a thousand couples shall suffer in married wretchedness than that one couple should have their bonds loosed. Such moralists usually have very tired-looking wives, children and homes. Yet it is the state that suffers most through the prolonged union of the thousand incompatible couples.

Because incompatibility is temperamental, it is none the less real; the greater the sensitiveness or refinement of either party the stronger is the repulsion. The self-control of social civilization often enables husbands and wives who have good incomes to pose in public conformably to etiquette; but, as the income lessens, such posing increases in difficulty, until it is almost impossible for a discordant married couple living in close quarters to get out of each other's way.

"Alas!" exclaims the Moralist of The Home, "one must not let feeling get the upper hand!" Of course, one must not. Neither must the incompatibility that eventuates in divorce be merely the climax of hysterics. It must be founded on deliberate judgment, intelligent forethought and persistent endeavor to have fulfilled all one's social, moral and religious obligations.

The plea of incompatibility carries with it a fearful breadth of laxity, before which the state may well be timorous, and the individual shrink lest he or she have yielded to "mere feeling." No other cause for divorce suggests such a weight of personal responsibility, which it seems as if an omniscient archangel alone could adjust. All of social, ethical, impulsive—all of modern altruism or of ancient self-sacrifice—still more, all the force of the direct relationship between God and man, the religious obligation of the created to the Creator, should be appealed to before one dared to present incompatibility as a plea for divorce. But the fact that most persons are not or will not be alive to this moral sense of personal responsibility, is no reason why such cause for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

divorce should not be alleged, to be proved or disproved by the investigation of the court into the previous character rather than the acts of the libellant.

Nevertheless, the selfishness that is generally mixed up with incompatibility increases the difficulties of "interviewing" either party with satisfactory results. It is so easy to humbug one's self into a delectable selfishness on the excuse of the need for moral or intellectual growth, or on the feeling born of a specious self-respect, that, since one cannot do good work for the world when the self is cramped by home conditions, one should not run the risk of lowering one's self to another's level. Truly, the delusions of selfishness are so chimerical it can almost be averred that a divorce for incompatibility should never take place between a childless couple, inasmuch as divorce is not wholly for the sake of one's self, but for one's children, actual or possible, and for the welfare of the state. Certainly under any circumstances incompatibility should endure for a considerable length of time before it is alleged as cause for divorce.

It is not to be denied, moreover, that divorce has been sought with abnormal avidity by people who ought to have got along together, and who often would have done so if opportunities for divorce had not multiplied themselves. Therefore is it that the necessity for more uniform legislation than now exists has become evident, that the peculiarity may cease of the validity of a marriage in one State which is invalid in another, or of the granting of a divorce in one part of the country which is not recognized elsewhere. Since it is said that forty-five different codes of law relating to marriage obtain there should be approximately uniform marriage and divorce laws, if only for the sake of children who legitimate in one State may not be, or indeed are not, in another. Yet if Congress should enact national marriage and divorce laws, it must do so either on very broad grounds or else on such narrow ones that human nature will provide for itself a mode of escape from the intolerable interference of legislation, by refraining from marriage.

Preferable to the latter alternative is the escape which is now possible through the opportunity of going from one State to another to obtain divorce, as a second legalized marriage is more agreeable even to those careless of conventions than the odium that now rightly rests upon a man and woman living together out-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

side of marriage, even if they shelter themselves under the pretext of thus developing their souls. Better yet is it that the uniformity which is so earnestly to be desired should be the accretion of slow, interstate growth, than of an obligatory national statute, which there is grave reason to fear would be prohibitory to such a degree as to increase illegitimacy rather than to protect the Home.

Scarcely any other subject becomes more involved with the personal point of view than marriage and divorce. One may argue from expediency, but one acts from feeling; though expediency and the right are usually identical in their finalities. Hence is it that any commission on uniformity of marriage and divorce laws, whether national or State, should include among its members neither cranks in rampant search for personal freedom, nor moral fanatics, ablaze with reformatory zeal for the protection of the Home. It might be well, also, that in such a commission there should be a small minority of divorced persons, who could argue from experience; since those who are more or less happily married think others might have managed as well as they did, few people having sufficient imagination to conceive that the opposite of their own ecstasy must be misery. It is those who do know the peace and strength of a harmonious marriage who should see to it that others are not compelled to lead a life-long, discordant union.

As the very essence of marriage is the right to individual contract, the integrity of marriage as a divine institution is attacked when the State insists upon its perpetuation after its conditions have become unholy, and in the name of duty degrades marriage. If a woman finds she has reckoned ill, then for the sake not alone of herself but of her children she seeks separation in the very name of the family, in order that the spiritual as well as the legal legitimacy of birth may be maintained. Hard as it is for a man to endure an unhappy marriage, it is infinitely harder for a woman—because she is a woman.

When the legal grounds for divorce are several, then it becomes expedient to safeguard those causes by defining periods of time for incubation of thought and prevention of hasty action. Especially is this true in regard to incompatibility, which should be not only "gross" but endured for a specific time before relief can be sought. Moreover, every State might well decree that no marriage should take place after divorce until the expiration of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

certain period, as many parties would not then be so eager to be divorced for the sake of speedy marriage in another direction—one becoming, as it were, a probationer between a second and first marriage, or on trial to one's self in regard to fixity of feeling. It is the immediate marriage after divorce, either of the so-called innocent or guilty party, that has helped to bring divorce into such questionable repute.

To protest, as argument against divorces, that the increase in them is "twice as great as the increase in population" settles nothing, unless it is deemed that the numerical units of population in themselves are of more value than the moral growth of a community; and that is not good social-economic doctrine.

Whether greater uniformity in legislation is to be effected by national or interstate authority, it is absurd that an absolute divorce granted in one State—Massachusetts, for instance—has not force in another State—say New York; and that the same two persons, living in holy, lawful wedlock in the one State, are leading a criminal existence in another by mere continuance of the same relation to each other as that previously held.

But, argues the humane Moralist, why not separation instead of divorce, as the self is then protected? It is just here that the State intervenes as interpreter of psychological consciousness, and determines that divorce, when desired, is better for the individual and the State than separation, since divorce carries with it permission to marry again. This is offensive to the churchman, who may yet eagerly avail himself of the "unto death" clause in the marriage service and become a widower repeatedly. More consistent are those sectarians who do not accept the limited liability act of death, but who, once married, are never wedded again. The "unity of monogamic consciousness," whatever that phrase means, is likely to be as much impaired by the second or third marriages of widows or widowers as by the marriage of divorced persons.

Whether or not one should seek separation or divorce is a consideration for personal decision. If one can be sure of never loving, nor even wishing to love, some one else, then surely separation is a better judicial proceeding than divorce and may be an edifying lesson in sublime patience. But, as human nature is subject to shocks of self-surprise, a divorce releases one from an unhappy marriage, and allows liberty to develop in the future in the way best suited to one's self by either a single or wedded life.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Especially would it work hard upon the unoffending party if separation were all that the law allowed. Half measures are seldom final, and happiness is a means of growth as truly as the discipline of sorrow.

The proposed canon for the Episcopal church says nothing about separation, perhaps because its recognition might weaken the binding of "holy matrimony as an estate for life." In such conjugal life-estate, however, there may be reason for discrimination between cause for divorce existing before a first marriage and cause arising after marriage on the ground that no one party can know all that the other party has done or not done or contracted before the first marriage, but that both parties are or should be cognizant of all that is done or not done by either after marriage.

However probable or improbable may be the latter degree of knowledge the contributory negligence of parents and of contracting parties themselves to a marriage concerning the previous habits and inheritances of either is the original cause of a great number of divorces. Make divorce possible; but surround the intention of marriage with such legal impediments that its solemnization will be impossible unless the welfare of the community is carefully guarded. It may or may not be a crime to wish to marry wealth; but it should be a crime to marry a diseased or profligate or criminal person. The "State Prevention of Marriages" may yet be legalized, though so far the State has benevolently made the conditions of marriage easy in order to prevent illegitimacy.

Parents never prove themselves less parental than when they forego inquiry into the antecedents of those seeking their children in marriage—antecedents which, beyond the pale of law yet inherited through offspring, become again factors in the moral and physical life of the community. It is in uniformity of legislation concerning marriage, without too much insistence upon the fact that one or both of the parties may have been previously divorced, more than in uniform laws anent divorce that prevention of divorce can be obtained. This is peculiarly true of the first marriage, which should never be lightly undertaken by either man or woman, nor indirectly abetted by the parents without full knowledge of the past and some gift of foresight of the future

It has been said that, though the nineteenth century began

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with an emphasis on the individual, it ended with emphasis on the community; therefore, divorces are to be forbidden Just as well might it be declared that divorces are to be allowed because of the community, when in point of fact four parties are involved in the theory of marriage or of divorce—the man, the woman, the children and the community To say that the law shall compel marriage to be a life relation is tyrannical, the church formula to the contrary notwithstanding (which will in time become as obsolete as in many services is already the word "obey"), with resulting increase of illegitimacy. Because one marriage has turned out unfortunately, can marriage never be tried again? The "solidarity" of an inharmonious family, a unit only in census statistics, has not even a fractional value in maintaining the "solidarity of the State and the purity of the church."

Whatever may be the source—nation or State—from which shall proceed greater uniformity in marriage and divorce laws, that uniformity is yet essential to the integrity of the family. Equally essential is it that divorce should be allowed for other than the "canonical cause." If, moreover, divorce is sought for other reasons than infidelity, non-support, wilful desertion or intolerable cruelty, the libellant in the suit should not be considered by society as an unworthy member of it. The personal equation in divorce, usually unseen and unheard, is often largely the chief reason for divorce, both for the sake of the children and for the good of the State. But out of personal righteousness alone, though aided for the time being by a modicum of parental legislation, can those conditions of mind arise which shall make marriage an honorable estate, in which shall be found fresh incentive to bequeath to the future still more nobly realized ideals of wedded life than were inherited from the past.

KATE GANNETT WELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ALFRED MILLENARY OF 1901.

BY F. YORK POWELL, REGIUS PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY, OXFORD UNIVERSITY.

On the 18th, 19th and 20th of September this year in the old, famous and beautiful city of Winchester there was held a solemn Commemoration of the millenary of King Alfred's death. A huge bronze statue of the hero by Thornycroft has been set up and unveiled; there were lectures and addresses delivered by notabilities in Church and State, in learning and letters. The town that Alfred loved was in high festival, her honored guests were warmly welcomed and the great occasion signalized by processions, illuminations and banquetings in which all sorts and conditions, from the children in the schools to the aged poor from the workhouse, had their share. Nor were the citizens and the Guildhall allowed to bear the responsibility alone; the bishop of the ancient diocese, the dean and canons of the Cathedral of St. Swithin, the head master of the famous and ancient College of St. Mary did their part. Soldiers, sailors and marines were present to line the streets and furnish the glad music of their bands. The historic sites preserved in the modern county-town that succeeds without a break to the little market-fort of the Belgae were all in turn visited and reviewed—the remains of the abbeys, new and old, of the Episcopal palace of Wolvesey, what is left of the castle of the King, the venerable West Gate of the city. The pleasant and antique hospitality of St. Cross was as freely dispensed as ever. The playing fields of Wykeham's College, the paradise and close of the exquisite cathedral, once dedicated to St. Peter and St. Paul, now to the Trinity; the beautiful view from the King's House which led Charles II. with characteristic feeling for art to plan a series of gardens that should rival Versailles in magnificence and out-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strip it in the beauty of their surroundings, were all duly admired. Winchester is determined to do her best to honor him whom Gibbon was not afraid to style "the greatest of English kings," one, too, especially associated with her own history. The callous and stupid neglect of the past is to be amply atoned for, and the generation that is of all since Alfred's most unlike his is prepared to do the highest honor to his name and fame.

Delegates from the English, Scottish and Irish universities were, of course, present, and with them stood scholars especially sent from the sister universities of Canada, Australia, New Zealand and India, as well as from the leading universities of the United States. Many of the list of leading Englishmen that form the committee for the Celebration also took part in the proceedings. The Lord Mayor of London and the Mayors and Provosts of many other towns attended in their Old World and picturesque panoply. The Commemoration was indeed one that appeals to the whole of the English-speaking world.

It is almost a new thing in modern England (common though it be abroad) to seek to do honor in this public way to heroes of the far past; we have not been, of late centuries, a people greatly given to pageants, our middle classes had almost lost the taste for public spectacles, though a few survivals such as the Lord Mayor's Show and the like were always keenly relished by the populace. We are getting rid of our awkward self-conscious dislike of the visible signs of public magnificence or national joy or grief. The great Guildhall masque showed that we could rival Vienna or Paris when we really set about a celebration of an artistic kind. The reviving taste for beautiful pageantry is, however, undoubtedly strong, and it naturally tends to reflect the prevalent feelings of the time. We English are now acutely conscious that our Empire, so long at peace within, has been most dangerously attacked by a cunning and malignant foe. We know that our envious enemies on the Continent are many and powerful, we are coming to understand the truth of the maxim that "only the strong man armed can keep his house and his goods," and we are making up our minds slowly but surely to the sacrifice of interests and prejudices that we see to be necessary. We delight intensely in the comradeship of our colonies and are proud of the ready and unselfish way in which they sprung to our assistance the moment the unity of the Empire and the future of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British South Africa was seen to be at stake. Hence to us to-day the career of Alfred appeals in a way it could not have appealed a generation ago. Alfred had to deliver and reorganize the England of his day as our statesmen have to deliver and reorganize the empire to-day. The example of men like Nelson, Drake, Henry VIII., Montfort, William the Marshall, a long line headed by Alfred himself, that saved England from the dominion of the alien, is becoming a real influence again. We may have to face Europe as our great grandfathers faced it, and we are glad to remember the proud and profitable lessons of the past.

Again, Alfred's literary work is far better known and appreciated now than it could be at the last Alfred celebration, half a century ago. The tongue he spoke and wrote is understood now as it was not then, his versions and his originals have been studied since to no small purpose. We look back fondly to the King that helped so greatly to make the mother tongue we speak fit for high and deep thought, apt to record exact facts, able to express all that can be expressed in language, to the painful student who did so much in his far-off day to make the rough speech of two or three millions of yeomen and fishermen the noble tongue of more than a hundred million of their descendants in the two most powerful and progressive nations of the world, and half a dozen rising English commonwealths, and the business and political tongue of some two hundred million more of other blood and other races.

Again, the details and the significance of Alfred's life and actions are probably better understood now than ever before since his own days and the days of his son. We can really estimate the importance of his work and the difficulties in his way, perhaps, even better than Gibbon himself, certainly more completely than William of Malmesbury. Our very distance from him brings his greatness out; he towers among his contemporaries and we see him afar off at his full height, the mighty tree that tops its fellows in the distant forest. Of course, Alfred has never been forgotten, no child that reads but knows his name as that of a gentle King that met adversity bravely and gave peace and justice to his country. Not all our long line of English rulers from Egbert to Victoria have left their names in the popular memory: local memory has preserved a few, the Confessor will not be forgotten at Westminster, nor Henry II. at Wood-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stock, nor Henry VI. at Eton, but King Canute, King John, old King Harry, Queen Bess, Oliver, good Queen Anne, Dutch William and honest George III. are known through the length and breadth of their land. In Alfred's case fond legendary remembrance of "The Truth-Teller, England's shepherd and Englishmen's darling," is amply justified by historic facts, clear and well attested.

The last fifty years have given us accurate and scientific editions of Alfred's own books and of the early books about him—Dr. Sweet's *Orosius* and *Pastoral,* Dr. Sedgefields' *Boëthius,* the *Laws* edited by Dr. Liebermann and Dr. Turk, the Dialogue by Professor Napier, *Asser* by Mr. W. H. Stevenson and the Old English chronicles by Dr. Earle and Mr. Plummer, as well as the many rich materials furnished by the editions of the Latin and French chronicles to be found in the Rolls Series, the British Museum charters and Mr. Keary's catalogue of Anglo-Saxon Coins.

Let us resume the results. Alfred's grandfather Egbert, son of Alhmund king in Kent, was one of the new generation of princes that stand grouped about Charles the Great, who was the leader of what might well be called the great Ninth Century Renaissance. Egbert was banished from his own country as a dangerous pretender in the way of the Mercian overlord and took refuge at the court of Charles the Frank, who was now, after his triumphs over the Lombards and Saxons, obviously the greatest ruler in Christendom. There he had noted the leading lines of the Frankish King's policy, he had seen him deal with the stubborn Saxons (men of his own blood), he had shared probably in his great campaigns against the heathen Huns, the dreaded pirates of the Steppes, he had possibly witnessed the proceedings of the council of Frankfort that condemned image worship and made a reform that it was hoped would purify and revivify the Christian church. He had seen the old alliance between the Pope and the King of the Franks culminate in the crowning of Charles Emperor of the Romans by Leo the Third on Christmas day, 800. He knew how Charles had made new capitularies and established the reign of law among the Franks; he had marked how greatly he cared for justice, how minutely royal officers watched and checked the local feudatories. He was aware of the care Charles took to foster trade, to keep up the roads and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to insure undisturbed markets. He met him, followed him in his marches; he may well have stood by him in battle and watched his generalship; he certainly knew the swift and stern punishment he dealt out to disturbers of his realm from within or from without. He must have met his learned countryman, Alhwin, and the band of foreign scholars that Charles gathered about him to teach in his Palace School and in his own Academy. And Egbert surely knew, as Charles himself knew, that not only from the East and from the South, but also from the North, danger was rising, and that the Roman Empire, East or West, nay, Christendom itself, could only be saved by the utmost exertions of the Roman emperor and the Christian people under him.

In good time the royal exile came back to his own land and put in practice much that he had learnt during his thirteen years with Charles. He climbed swiftly to the unstable West-Saxon throne, a lucky and acceptable claimant, but when he died he held the strongest and widest domain that any English-speaking king had yet held in Britain. He had defeated the jealous and restless Welsh princes upon his borders, he had overcome his Mercian rivals, he had secured the overlordship of the Northumbrians, he had met and defeated the formidable Danes who had already made the Pictish kings' position precarious and ravaged and occupied great part of Ireland. He had made a close alliance with the Church at Canterbury, whose ruler was, in truth, the English patriarch and a prelate ever in close touch with the great Frankish churchmen and the Pope. But when Egbert died, though his skill and energy had exalted the West Saxon crown, the outlook for his nation and his family was not so bright as when he came back from exile well-nigh forty years before.

The grandsons of Charles were quarrelling with their father; the Saracens were gaining ground in the Mediterranean islands and on the Italian mainland and in the East, though Barcelona was still the western bulwark of Frankish Christendom; the Northmen were growing stronger and bolder both in the North Sea and in the Baltic; the Bulgarians and the Paulicians in the East seemed to be endangering the creed and the temporal power of Christendom; the insane quarrels of the families that ruled at Aix and Byzantium weakened the Christian cause, though the Frankish and Roman armies were still superior to any organized force in the world. Egbert's son Ethelwulf, pious and brave and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eager to do well, yet, like Charles's son Lewis, showed a certain weakness at times that threatened to end in family dissensions, but for all that he met the Northmen handsomely in the field, drove back their Welsh allies and endeavored to strengthen his position by marrying his daughter Ethelswith to the Mercian king, Burhred; by visiting the gallant Pope, who had just saved Rome from the swarming Saracens by his own exertion; and by allying himself to the daughter of Charles the Bald, who was busy resisting the inroads of the Northmen and the incursions of the Saracens of Spain and Africa.

When he died the danger was nearer, but he had done his best to prepare to meet it. His sons were wiser than Lewis's. They agreed to take up the royal burden one after the other. In eight years' time the two elder had ruled and died. England had been threatened, but was not yet seriously attacked, though Winchester had been stormed and sacked by a sudden raid and the Northmen were active along the coast.

In 866, when the third brother, Ethelred, a young man of little more than twenty-one, came to the throne, the storm burst and the Great Host from combined fleets under Northern and Danish leaders determined to carve out new kingdoms in the Britains, as for the time the Franks had become too hot for them to meddle with, hoping, perhaps, also that with a fair base in Britain they would be able to secure what of Gaul they wished when the time was come and their prey was riper.

Northumberland bore the first brunt of their deadly attack, her rival kings united for a brief space to resist the invaders, but were swiftly borne down and slain, the Mercian king (brother-in-law of the West Saxon princes) called earnestly for their help against the cunning and prowess of the sons of Lodbroc, most dreaded of all sea kings of their day, who were believed to have a particular feud against the English in the north. And now it is that we see Alfred the Etheling taking his place at his brother's side and entering public life as his trusty lieutenant and counsellor.

Of the young prince's early life a few significant facts are noted. He came of a fine stock on his mother's side, for Osburh, the daughter of Oslac, the King's cup-bearer, was well born and a good woman. He was born at the royal estate of Wantage, in Berkshire, 848, not many miles from Oxford. His childhood was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remarkable. He was first sent at the age of five to Rome to Leo IV. by his father, probably with the idea that the special papal benediction and consecration of this, his favorite and most promising son, would mark him out by evident tokens for the eventual succession and so secure that the brothers should succeed each other rather than that the realm should fall into the hands of a child-king. The boy was but seven years old when he journeyed home with his father, who had brought him out a second time in 855 to the Pope, his kindly godfather. They passed through Gaul and visited the western Emperor, and at Verberie Alfred saw Ethelwulf take the child Judith to wife as a pledge of alliance between him and the King of the Romans. Alfred had looked on much that was noteworthy at an age when clever children will notice much—the visible splendor of papal and imperial majesty, the sacred and strange glory of the great stone palaces and basilicas of Italy and Gaul, the stately etiquette and affluence of the foreign courts, the orderly array of imperial and papal hierarchy, the mighty works of the warrior Pope, his benefactor, the hosts of Italy and Gaul and Germany, armed and disciplined after the Roman traditions of New Rome, wonders of art, a multitude of things that contrasted with the circumstances in which his own life was to be passed. These he could hardly forget, and his love of the arts and crafts, the ready welcome he gave to strangers, his generous acknowledgment of his debt to the churches abroad for the prayers and skill and learning with which they endowed Christendom, his eager willingness to learn and teach, his conviction of the necessity of knowledge and thought for the nobles and prelates, leaders temporal and spiritual, of his people, his broad prudence and just foresight seem to be the final fruits of impulses set going by this memorable time. Cadwalla and Ine had gone to Rome to learn to die, as many more English pilgrims had done; Rome helped Alfred to learn to live. That he loved the old songs and traditions of his own people, that he was original enough to try and make his own speech a classic tongue instead of trying to force Latin upon an unwilling people as a vehicle for knowledge, that he ever busied himself much with hounds and horses and hawks, that he was keenly interested in art and handicrafts and those that exercised them, that he made himself skillful in law and good at his weapons shows that he had a bent of his own. The fatherless child of ten throve under

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the care, probably, of his mother's kin. His own estates were in the southwest, but we know he must have moved about from place to place, whether he dwelt with his brethren the kings or no. By the time he had reached his twentieth year and took to himself a wife, Ealswith, daughter of Alderman Ethelred Mucil of the Gainas, a woman of Mercian royal blood on the side of her mother, Eadburh, he was already apt for the duties of his rank as a big landowner and a gentleman of the blood royal. His biographer and friend tells us that he was already of a pious and dutiful mind, and that he had been for some years sorely afflicted by a tiresome and painful chronic malady that troubled him most by threatening to hinder him in his life's work, but (as he believed in answer to his prayers) this disease now passed from him to give place to another that, though it gave him pain, did not interfere with his daily business. The call to the active public life for which he had prepared came very soon after his wedding, and from this year, 868, till he died, thirty-two years after, Alfred was ceaselessly busy. It was the distress of Burhred assailed by Ingwar and Hubba that brought him forward. The swift march of the young brothers, King and Etheling, seems to have surprised the Northmen who were driven into Nottingham, an easy place to defend if they were provisioned, but a close blockade forced them to seek for peace. Tricked by Ingwar's cunning Ethelred gave the invaders favorable terms instead of making up his mind to crush them at all costs. Burhred was left tottering on his throne, and the enemy's next move was to attack Edmund, the young king of the the East English, who was defeated, captured in flight and cruelly martyred on the 20th of November, 870. Guthrum the Dane reigned in his stead; Halftan, one of Lodbroc's sons, was king in York over Northumbria; both there and in East England the invaders began to settle and till the land. The Midlands bought off the Danes for a time after the foolish Frankish fashion, but now the West-Saxon kingdom itself was to be assailed. The northern host, the eastern host and the hosts from the midlands, two kings and seven earls, the pick of three or four Wicking fleets, crossed the Thames in 871 and took up their post at Reading, whence they could move down the Thames or up the Kennet Valley and south into the dales of Hampshire, or along the ridge into the western shires to the very heart of Ethelred's land. Battle after battle was fought with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much stubborn slaughter but no conclusive result; even the famous fight at Ashdown, where the White Horse now gleams, when the broken Danes fled and fell mile after mile, till the remnant reached their earthwork between the Thames and Kennet, failed to stop the invaders. Both English and Northmen soon rallied in force, fresh levies came up from the West-Saxon shires and fresh crews from the Danish fleet; the invaders forced their way over the downs, battle after battle was fought and at one, fought at Marden, Wiltshire, Ethelred was wounded to the death, and Alfred at twenty-three was left to take up the troublous crown in the midst of the campaign. He fought on, and at last the Danes withdrew sullenly from Wessex. The wretched Burhred, cut off from his friends, was forced to make peace on what terms he could get, and soon, hopeless of the future of his kingdom and his kindred, he left his country and went to Rome to seek peace. There he soon died, and the puppet king set up for a short while in his place was the last Mercian king of English blood.

A few years later, after many fierce engagements by land and sea, the Danes, who now occupied the greater part of the Midlands as well as the North and East, determined on a fresh attack on Wessex, aiming at the southwest, for if that were subdued the West-Saxon realm must fall into their hands. The heathen fleet and army moved in concert along the Roman roads and along the coast. The fleet having wintered at South Wales, suddenly sailed southeast, about to attack the important border city of Exeter, while the army under Guthrum dealt with the cities of the Severn and Avon plains and a huge stronghold of well-planned earthworks was raised at Chippenham as a center from which to raid. But the fleet under Hubba was defeated with heavy loss and that leader's death by the good men of Devon and the taking of his enchanted raven banner was regarded by English and Northmen alike as an evil omen for the cause of Lodbroc's sons. Alfred, however, met with poor support at first against Guthrum, many of his best men had fallen in the former campaign, many distrusted his powers, many, tired of the struggle, had followed Burhred's example and fled abroad. Until the king could gain the confidence of the western levies he was obliged to take refuge in the Isle of Athelney among the Parret marshes with a small guard and a few personal followers. But now, in 878, after weeks of quiet work, the levies were ready to follow him, the southwest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rallied cheerily to the beacon fire that was the signal for the English muster. The battle of Edington drove the Danes into Chippenham, which was cut off from all succor by Alfred's able tactics. A few days' hunger forced Guthrum to surrender at discretion, and the treaty that followed was the first step since Egbert's alliance with the Archbishop of Canterbury toward the building up of an English kingdom of all England. A *modus vivendi* was arranged between Guthrum and his Danes and the English king, limits were fixed, arrangements were made for trade, the elements of border law, that should provide for peaceful intercourse, were agreed to. Above all, Guthrum and his men were to accept the Christian faith. The terms were fairly well kept by the Danes, and Wessex was again freed of their unwelcome presence. In 879 Alfred was able to begin his task of reorganization, in which he spent twelve years' busy and fruitful work.

The old Teutonic system (long disused in a country where local feuds had taken the place of regular wars), by which half the shire-levy was to be ready to muster while the other half remained at home to till the fields, a convenient and traditional usage, was now revived. New shires were formed in the English midlands by the rearrangement of groups of hundreds round carefully selected and garrisoned strongholds chosen by reason of their situation and command of country. Fortresses were marked out to be raised in convenient and defensible spots along the coast, a fleet was built and largely manned by hired Frisian seamen, on a new model of the king's own, the ships bigger and more seaworthy than the flat one-decked thirty-oared Danish keels that were fit for coasting and bay-fishing, but often unequal to the stormy season on the main sea and to the rough currents of our uncharted tidal waters. Local magnates of trust and experience were set as aldermen over the new shires and their behavior as judges and lawyers carefully looked to. The old *custumals* and *novellae* of Ethelbert and Ine were republished and a number of new statutes passed by the Wise Men, at Alfred's initiative, were added to them. The king himself, one of whose main ends as a lawgiver was to substitute the "law of court" for the "law of feud and *vendetta*," made continual progresses through his own kingdom, while Alderman Ethelred, a Mercian of notable gifts, acted as his lieutenant over the part of his dead brother-in-law's king-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dom that had now fallen to him. The broken communication with the Churches of the east and of Rome was resumed, London was resettled, its wall repaired and placed in Ethelred's charge to secure the mouth of the Thames and the Lea and to take up again the interrupted trade with Gaul and the Rhinelands. The king procured teachers from Wales, from Gaul and the Midlands for himself and the Palace School, which he now established after Charles the Great's model. The revenue was carefully estimated and assigned, and the court service organized on a new footing, the servants and guards being parcelled out in three four-month shifts, which succeeded each other in attendance on the king. Foreigners who could bring knowledge or skill of any kind were welcomed and maintained at the king's expense. And now, in the brief leisure secured by an exact arrangement of the day's duties, Alfred and his scholars set to work to translate into English, for clerks and laymen alike, the books the king thought would be of most use—*Orosius,* his sketch of the world's history and geography, to which the king added the voyages of Othere the Helgolander and Wolfstan the Englishman; the *Consolation of Boëthius,* with many reflections of the king's own interspersed among the chapters of the last Roman philosopher, the *Herd Book of Pope Gregory* (a copy for each bishopric), and his Dialogues and the Blooms, selections from the Soliloquies of Augustine, Baeda's English Church History (translated by one of his Mercian scholars), and, lastly, the Chronicles drawn up under his eye, partly, perhaps, at his dictation, as we can hardly doubt, at Winchester. His own last work, a translation of the Psalms, he was not granted time to finish.

In every department of Alfred's work difficulties met him—ignorance, indolence, prejudice—but he persevered; what he had to do was necessary and must be done. Much was achieved before the even tenor of his labors was again interrupted.

In 891 the Danes met a crushing blow in their defeat by the Dyle, in the Low countries, at the hands of the gallant Carling king Arnold. Haesten, the boldest, wildest and most determined of their leaders, resolved to attempt the conquest of Wessex and secured the assistance of many of the Wickings that were drawing off from the Frankish domains, hopeless of further success there. The attack was well planned and cleverly and boldly carried out; full advantage was taken of the foolish neglect of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kentish men who had left unclosed the forts that were meant to guard the southeast coast; but the fate of England was secure as long as Alfred, or the son and daughter he had trained carefully in his ways and set to work to carry out his policy, should remain at the helm of England. Haesten and the fleet leaders made repeated raids and dangerous incursions, but they were defeated in detail, pursued on their marches, beset in their strongholds; the whole kingdom was confident in the king; his aldermen, his bishops and the shire-levies stood by him manfully. Haesten fought well; he was desperate; it was his last cast for a great prize. The settled Danes foreswore their obligations in favor of their kinsfolk and gave succor and supplied soldiers to the invaders, but the inevitable end came, and Haesten and his followers were forced out of the kingdom. He went off to Iceland to found a family there and make a new home. Other Wickings tried to settle for a time in Ireland or Scotland; some went back to Norway to be met by the stern rule and heavy hand of Fairhair and forced to live peaceably or fly to settle in the new-found lands of the far northwest. By 896 the king was free again to go on with the ordinary labors of his toilsome life. The losses of the war in money, stock and men (made heavier by the murrain and plague that had lately afflicted the land) had to be repaired. Councils were held, the whole business of peace was resumed.

Four more years of toil, and then, worn out, as we may suppose, by his unceasing exertions and by the inroads of the disease that had weakened his hardly-tried frame, Alfred fell ill, and died on October 26th, 900. He had begun the task of reabsorbing the Danish settlements in South Britain into his own all-English kingdom, but he was not to live to see more than the beginning of the successful progress by which his children and grandchildren realized his idea.

It is not easy to overrate Alfred's achievements as commander. The conditions of the Danish war were such as the English organization was ill-fitted to meet, the heathen fleets composed of scores of boats, manned by forty or fifty warriors each, could move far faster along the coast with a fair wind than the English levies could follow. The crew of such a fleet, disciplined, hardy, veteran fighters, accustomed to face emergencies deftly and to act swiftly at word of command, were more than a match for the disorderly and unskilled levies of any single shire. These fleets could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

combine and separate easily, their captains could plan simultaneous attacks on various quarters at a given time. They would land in a convenient estuary, run up a stockade to defend their ships, raid the neighborhood of horses and cattle, slaves and spoil, sally forth mounted on the stolen English horses, riding by night and day along their chosen roads, to fall upon defenceless districts and outflank the slower defenders. They were hard to fight with, difficult to keep in touch with, dangerous to attack. By means of two or three fortified stations on the coast they were able to master broad stretches of country, whence they could draw supplies in safety, while they were able at any time to sally forth swiftly and silently upon the lands beyond. They were as bad to treat with as to fight with. They broke again and again the solemn oaths they had sworn. They found well wishers among the jealous Welsh and traitors even among the despairing English, some of whom chose rather to obey a Danish king than risk all they had in a struggle they had begun at one time to look upon as hopeless. The Danes lived on the country and made great profit out of the war, trading away cargoes of slaves and loads of precious booty to the Jewish merchants in Gaul, who supplied them with arms and cloth and wine and ornaments. They were traders as well as fighters, they struck money in great quantities, and they were well served by their agents and spies, who profited by the commerce they created. In skill and courage, infinite sailorly resource and cool contempt of death they were beyond any fighting men of their day; they were, indeed, the very flower of the finest of the Teuton race. A spirit of adventure akin to that of the Crusaders, of the *Conquistadores,* of the Elizabethan seamen, filled their souls, but they had another side to their minds, and it was on their practical wisdom and shrewd grasp of fact that Alfred based his hopes when he treated with Guthrum. The Danes could see the advantage of strong, orderly rule; they frankly acknowledged the English as their closest kinsmen. Both sung of the same heroes and traced their royal blood back to the same gods. They were not averse to the manifold attractions of the new faith and accepted it readily, as sensible men awake to the advantages it offered. In a few generations they became good Englishmen, though they kept their own names and their own peculiar laws and customs, which, after all, were as close as possible to those of the English themselves. They feared and re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spected the spiritual power and order which was the greatest legacy that pagan Rome left the Western world. To many a settled Northman it seemed easier to live under a West-Saxon king than under Fairhair. The third choice was a far voyage and a rough life in unknown lands. Most of those who were not of noble blood preferred the strong peace of the West-Saxon king, and many of high rank were won over by the wisdom of Alfred, by the possibilities that opened before them in the new England which he was building up, and by the manifold attractions of the Christian civilization of Western Europe.

The reign that had begun in the darkness of a black night ended in the light of dawn; the future loomed fair; Englishmen and their leaders had gained confidence; they had been tried and not found wanting. In the north, beyond the English border, the stronger Scottish kings had succeeded to the weaker Picts and Constantine's defeat of the Northmen in 904 had, possibly, almost as much to do with the colonization of Iceland as Fairhair's earlier and more famous victory at Hafrsfiord. The settlement of the last of the Wickings, like Alfred himself, one of our Queen Victoria's ancestors, Hrolf, son of Rognwold, earl of Moere, on the valley of the Seine and the coast rivers of Neustria, and the succession of his half-brother Einar to the earldom of the Orckneys, closed the Wickingtide. New and great developments came of the stir and activity of that fierce epoch. And these new developments Alfred had largely helped to shape.

Of Alfred's bodily presence and features we have no account, his biographer's unfinished sketch of him does not help us, but of the character and bent of his mind there is much evidence in his own words. He thought boldly and clearly on intellectual things as he did in practical matters; he had devised for himself a *clothes philosophy* long before Carlyle; his Theory of Nobility, namely, that *the right nobility is in the mind,* was the one which afterward found warm acceptance from Sordello and from his pupil, Dante; he had grasped the *law of causation* with as great dialectic skill as the later school men and divines; to better ethical purpose, in thoughts more elevated he reasoned high.

"Of providence, fore-knowledge, will and fate."

He conceived as spiritually of God, as did the Eastern Sage of old. "He is wisdom, He is reason itself," he said.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To the statesman and warrior that saved his own country in her hour of need, preserved her national individuality, and paved the way to her future unity; to the scholar and man of letters that first made of our English tongue an avenue to all the knowledge of the past, a vehicle for the highest expression of human thought that the world was then capable of; that raised his vernacular to the rank of a classic language, is due, at least, the gratitude of those whom he has benefited. Alfred's life was not an easy one: "Hardship and grief not a king but would desire to be free of if he could, but I know that he cannot." He bade a man do his duty and look to no reward but God, but the good report of his fellows was dear to him as it was to the greatest of his time. A northern contemporary, one of his foemen, possibly, has put this strong Teutonic feeling in a simple and direct way:

Cattle die, kinsfolk die,
  Land and lea are wasted,
One thing that never dies I know—
  Men's judgment on the dead.

Cattle die, kinsfolk die,
  And man himself dies,
But never dies good report
  Away from him that won it.

And Alfred himself has recorded in well-known words his heart's desire: "This I can now most truly say, that I have desired to live worthily while I lived, and after my life to leave to the men that should be after me a remembrance in good works."

Surely to grant this man his wish that his good works should be held in loving memory by his own people is but a plain and grateful duty, and certainly his example is not one that we in England, or you in the United States, can at any time or in any way afford to neglect. And to bring Alfred's good works and noble example clearly before the English-speaking world is, I take it, the real object of this Millenary Commemoration.

F. York Powell.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STRENGTH OF CHRISTIAN SCIENCE.—A FINAL WORD.

BY W. D. M'CRACKAN, NEW YORK MEMBER OF THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.

THE strength of Christian Science lies in its practical results. It is a positive force. It arrests attention by its dynamics. On every hand people speak of the happy changes it has wrought in their friends or families. They know of former drunkards who through it have lost all desire for stimulants, morphine fiends who are freed from the drug, dishonest men and women made honest and pure, boorish and selfish persons becoming refined and loving, lifelong invalids rendered hale and hearty, chronic grumblers turned into cheery good fellows, consumptives healed, and the insane restored to their right minds. They see husbands and wives reunited and harmony enter homes where discord once reigned. They find gross materialists taking pleasure in spiritual matters, and agnostics and so-called atheists coming like little children to learn of the Scriptures.

If Christian Science had done nothing more than to supply the "Key to the Scriptures," which has unlocked the treasures of the Bible to those who were once indifferent or actually hostile, this alone would have sufficed to earn for it the high place among the older Christian denominations which it is taking to-day.

The Earl of Dunmore, writing on the subject of Christian Science to a London newspaper, made this striking statement: "Christian Science can count to-day among its followers in both hemispheres professional men and women of the highest class, scholarly ecclesiastics, students of both sexes with brilliant university records, officers of high scientific attainments in both services, statesmen, judges, lawyers, philosophers and doctors."

Christian Scientists do not profess to be better than any one else; they merely claim to be better than they used to be—better fathers and mothers, better children, better business men, profes-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sional men, artists, day laborers, or whatever their occupations may be, and better Christians. Their faith does not merely theorize about ways and means for accomplishing desirable results. It actually reforms the sinner and heals the sick. Hundreds of thousands, probably a million, earnest and enthusiastic men and women have already experienced this glorious regeneration. Every Wednesday evening in every Christian Science Church the testimonies of those who have found health and happiness in this faith may be heard by visitors. The Christian Science denomination has now more than five hundred churches in various parts of the world, with reading rooms in most of the larger cities and in many of the smaller ones. These churches and reading rooms are free and open daily. Christian Scientists never proselyte, and they never dedicate a church building until it is paid for. These are substantial facts.

Moreover, it is significant that Christian Science made its appearance at a time when materialism and scepticism in matters of religion seemed to be gaining rapidly. It found men leaving the churches and trying to satisfy their religious instincts by taking refuge in philosophic vagaries. It made these men devout churchgoers and punctured the claims of man-made speculative theories and false sciences. The tide has turned. The stream of modern thought flows toward Christianity and no longer away from it. The world is passing through a new religious birth, more momentous even than that of the Reformation and to be likened only to the beginning of the Christian era.

This great movement is not only Christian and thus ethical and spiritual in its import, but it is also scientific, as its name of Christian Science implies. It is satisfied, however, with nothing less than an ultimate and absolute meaning for this word. Mrs. Eddy says in *Science and Health*, on page 21: "The term Science, properly understood, refers only to the laws of God and His government of the universe, including man." This lofty conception throws the mind at once into the beyond of physics, into metaphysics, into the realm of Spirit or Mind, which is also the realm of the Real. This scientific aspect of Christian Science is being constantly confirmed and corroborated by the inventions, discoveries and independent conclusions of the more advanced natural scientists. The latter find that all their investigations into matter bring them nearer to an unknown Some-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing which cannot be perceived by the five physical senses, but whose presence is necessary in order to explain their own calculations. This Something is Mind, God, whose laws form the real Science for which they are actually searching.

Christian Science is also notably aesthetic in tendency. It preaches and teaches beauty as a natural expression of goodness. It sees no virtue in a sham spirituality which looks sickly, or dowdy, or sordid. It believes in happiness and good cheer and in abundance. It calls upon men to take possession of their material surroundings, lest their material surroundings take possession of them; and to do this with an understanding of God as the source of all supply, the good Father-Mother, whose wish it is that all children should be fed bountifully at the parental table. Christian Scientists, therefore, give out freely and liberate themselves from the hoarding instinct. They are not afraid to make their churches as beautiful as they can, and to rejoice in art as the servant of truth. This is one reason, among others, why so many artists, painters, musicians and actors find their spiritual homes in Christian Science.

Another valuable result accomplished by Christian Science is the placing of man and woman upon an equal footing within its denominational organization. The wish for such equality has often been expressed by political, social, economic, as well as religious reformers and the theoretical benefits stated, but Christian Science actually practices this equality. As an example of this let me state that the two readers in Christian Science churches consist of a man and a woman, and that throughout the church government women are placed on a footing of entire equality with men. This remarkable result may well arrest the attention of reformers who have long fought against the traditional belief of woman's supposed intellectual inferiority. They should rejoice at this notable victory, accomplished quietly and without noisy propaganda or popular agitation.

As all rivalry and sense of sex superiority or inferiority tends to disappear in Christian Science so social distinctions lose their force within its ranks, and the real worth of men and women begins to be appreciated without preconceived prejudice. The same may be said of national and race hatreds. They are swallowed up in the overwhelming universal love which radiates from the true spiritual understanding.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Christian Scientists interpret the Declaration of Independence in a spiritual sense. They believe that "all men are created equal," that men are "endowed with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." No body of people more scrupulously respect the individual rights of others. It is one of their cardinal principles that all men must work out their own problems, or in plain words must mind their own business. They insist upon the "right to life." They go so far as to say that there is no real death; that God Himself is Life and that He is All Power, and that, therefore, death can have no being, no entity, no existence. They praise "liberty"—the liberty of the sons of God. For what liberty can be compared to the freedom from the harrowing and harassing spectre called fear with its train of physical ills and mental and moral errors? They preach "the pursuit of happiness." They pursue happiness with determination and with much success. It is their principal business in life to find out first what happiness is; then to pursue it, and to overtake and possess it, too. Whatever their faults may be, they are certainly not an unhappy people. Captious critics have even accused them of being too happy!

But serious investigators into the truths of Christian Science no longer question the mental, moral and physical transformations which stand to its credit. They only ask themselves, how can these things be? It is plain that those ecclesiastical critics who cannot explain the works of Jesus, his disciples, the apostles and the early Christians except as miracles, cannot ask to be heard concerning Christian Science which shows that there are no miracles at all, but that these works were in accordance with spiritual law. Nor can those psychologists expect a hearing who assure us that fetichism and voodooism come under the same law as the healing done by Jesus.

Christian Science heals through faith, interpreted as spiritual understanding—not through blind belief, or human credulity. This spiritual understanding is the only true knowledge, the only real Science, because it deals with the indestructible and the eternal truths of existence. To have this spiritual understanding is to know God; and St. John assures us that "to know" God is "life eternal."

What an exalted understanding of this Science must Peter have possessed, when "at the gate of the temple which is called

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Beautiful," he could say to the lame man: "Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have I thee give. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." And again, when he could say to Tabitha, lying seemingly dead upon her bed, "Tabitha, arise."

In view of the very real and substantial facts which mark the growth of Christian Science, it is surprising that a writer in the September number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW should return to the charge with an article entitled, "The Phantom Fortress of Christian Science." Why should he continue to pursue phantoms? It is also astonishing that this writer should express a desire to eliminate personal allusions from the discussion, and yet should fill his own writings with most discourteous and frequently false references to Mrs. Eddy.

Nor can his use of the phrase, "to bring the leaders of Christian Science to book," be allowed to pass unrebuked. It is in reality an impertinence—if nothing worse—for any one to attempt to prejudice public opinion in this manner. The courts have decided apparently against the wishes of this critic, and honest citizens are in the habit of abiding by judicial decisions. His phrase breathes the same spirit of intolerance and reaction which was voiced by the Church of England against Wesley and Methodism.

It is no "sacrilege" for modern Christians to try to imitate the works of Jesus, because he commanded us to "heal the sick," and assured us: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I shall do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father." Christian Scientists cannot see in the works of Jesus mere exhibitions of a "supernatural" power, but rather definite results flowing from Jesus' glorious spiritual understanding. If Jesus' healing had been wholly "supernatural," He would not have said, "The works that I do shall he do also."

Science and Health, on page 224, says, appropriately: "Because you cannot walk on the water and raise the dead, you have no right to question the great might of Divine Science in this direction. Be thankful that Jesus who was its true demonstrator did this, and left his example for us. We can use only what we understand, and must prove our faith by our works."

The critic's hesitating and qualified indorsement of "under-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standing, faith and prayer," is met by the following words from *Science and Health*, page 98: "We admit that God hath almighty power, is a 'present help in time of trouble'; and yet we rely on a drug to heal disease, as if senseless matter had more power than omnipotent Spirit."

In answering the critic's prophecy concerning the Discoverer and Founder of Christian Science and Christian Science itself "after her death" I can best quote from Mrs. Eddy's message to The First Church of Christ, Scientist, in Boston, Massachusetts, in which she answered a similar clerical prophecy: "I am sorry for my critic, who reckons hopefully on the death of an individual who loves God and man; such foreseeing is not foreknowing, and exhibits a startling ignorance of Christian Science and a manifest unfitness to criticise it or to compare its literature."

But what influence can criticism exert upon substantial facts? The simplest case of healing through Christian Science overturns all the objections which a doubting mind can muster in array. Sincere searchers after the Truth are accepting the overwhelming testimony of Christian Scientists. Looking ahead, they see a gradual and glorious conquest of sin and sickness. They also see a wonderful readjustment of the relations of men. The whole spectacle of these false relations between mortals is a mere spectacle and nothing more. The greed, envy, hatred and revenge which mark these relations and set individuals and nations at variance with each other are produced in the last analysis by a stupendous fraud called fear. Fear is the stimulus which prompts mortals to trample upon each other where there is room for all, to rob each other when there is more than enough for all. Fear and its progeny fill the hospitals, prisons and insane asylums. Fear of what? Fear of want, fear of death.

Christian Science is waging a warfare of "no quarter" against fear expressed in sin and sickness. It brings to this task a spiritual understanding derived from the Scriptures, as interpreted to our age by Mrs. Eddy. In order to deliver this message she has passed through the valley of persecution, but the day of blind antagonism is passed. The day of loving action and co-operation has arrived.

Mrs. Eddy has shown a deep spiritual nature from her very girlhood. She grew up in New Hampshire in a strict New England environment, and to this day she speaks affectionately of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

devout clergymen who were in the habit of visiting her father's house. "As early as 1862 she began to write down and give to friends the result of her Scriptural study, for the Bible was her sole teacher." (*Science and Health,* Preface, page VIII.) In 1866 she discovered "The system which she denominated Christian Science." (Preface, page VIII.) "The first edition of *Science and Health* was published in 1875." (Preface, page X.)

In the year 1878 Mrs. Eddy was called to preach in Boston at the Baptist Tabernacle of the Rev. Daniel C. Eddy, D. D. In 1879 she founded the first Christian Science Church.

These dates seem very recent when we consider the enormous work done in the interval, and they point to Mrs. Eddy as a woman of very remarkable gifts. She is now receiving the loving gratitude of great multitudes who have never seen her but have read her books and benefited by them. In response to a spontaneous desire to express their affection Christian Scientists have endowed her with the endearing name of "Mother." This does not mean that they worship her personality, as has been stated. They reverence her as the person who has by a new spiritual interpretation of the Scriptures shown them the way out of sin and sickness.

Imagine a world in which the press and the pulpit, the university and the various professions as well as the business world should find their chief joy in praising and expressing Life and Love! Imagine a world of happy men and women, starting out to do their day's work, guarded, guided and controlled solely by God, and fed by Substance! Imagine them manifesting imperishable individuality and special gifts, yet dwelling in the One Mind, conscious only of One Power and Intelligence, united in one indissoluble bond, and acknowledging one supreme Being!

In such a world all so-called material problems would be solved by Mind; the everpresent thought of Life would drive away all fear of death; the knowledge of Truth would dispel all doubt and suspicion, and Love would cast its glow of joy and its glory of happiness over all men and over the whole universe.

W. D. McCrackan.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME THOUGHTS ON PAIN AND DEATH.

BY H. B. MARRIOTT-WATSON.

THE foundations of Life are laid very deep and intricately, yet they are most precarious; and it is no doubt this very delicacy and elaboration that render them so. Man has ascended out of a remote and somewhat ignoble past by innumerable confluences of blood and nerve and character, and the roots of his life go down into an unknown soil. Yet the strangeness of the situation lies in this, that all this ceremonious life, all this mechanical perfection, the whole of this ancient and slowly evolving design, is built about five small senses. For, lacking the senses, the human body is inconceivable; even to the lowest forms of protoplasm some rudiments of a sense attach. It is to those five open avenues that human life is indebted for its knowledge, its reason, its discoveries, its civilization, which is to say its general progress from an unknown womb. To shut off one of these conduits by which human beings obtain their impressions of the world would be seriously to emasculate the life of any particular person; on the contrary, to add another sense would be to create a new class or order of being which would be manifestly superior to ourselves. This subjection to the senses, this dependence upon them for our relation with external phenomena makes all human knowledge relative. The things-in-themselves of which Plato wrote, and (if we must believe him) of which Socrates spoke, must be the limitation of our senses be forever unknown. All that we can see are these "absolutes" as reflected in five facets. To seize the whole in its truth and entirety would be possible only to a being whose senses were infinite; that is to say, a being whom we are unable to conceive, if not to conjecture.

These senses, then, which are the limit of our knowledge, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form a system of communication with ourselves, and between one another, must be of necessity paramount in their importance. We depend upon their accuracy for the justice of our impressions, and whilst there is no definite proof that, say, a color or a sound represents to each person the same value or fact, it is a postulate that we must make ere we set forth, if there is to be any argument at all. The frail alleys, one of which at least has fallen long since into disrepair and is but imperfectly used, have been the means of evolution. Piece by piece and parcel by parcel, globule by globule and cell by cell, has the inherited information of the senses built up the human body and the human mind. The great process of evolution asks long periods of time, and geology grants them. A million years in her sight are but as yesterday. So that some time far back, man, endowed now with superior faculties and grown gregarious and social, developed for himself a theory of morals. There is little doubt that the development of a code of morals was of a piece with the progressive movement which has evolved him bodily. There was to be no pause or stay because he had grown upright, walked firmly upon feet and had lost the hair of his body. On the contrary, the vital principle, relieved of the arduous work of constructing a home, fell quickly to the still more difficult and sacred task of developing a proper tenant for that home. In the course of evolution man came, therefore, to shape for himself and his fellows a number of rules which must regulate their social lives. Thus it is that the word "moral" has arisen; for the Latin tongue fully recognized the ultimate derivation of the Roman ethical system. It was founded in its essence on custom; that is, upon those laws which society had considered wise and necessary for the common good. That in different countries and under different skies the moral codes should vary very widely was a natural result of that variation of habit, structure and climate which is one of the main causes of evolution. The utility of the code was the prime necessity. A society of people in its early stages collects about it certain obligations and responsibilities which must be met and undertaken if the tribe is to hold together. The conscience of the tribe will also have reached a certain height and definite religious scruples, sanctions and beliefs will have coagulated in the mind. It is to meet this double condition—the relations of the individual members of the tribe with one another and their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relations with the invisible world—that the ethical system is slowly shaped.

But it would be unwise to suppose that because each people fashioned a system of morality which met its needs, any standing morality prevailing in any part of the world is sufficient, or just, or pure. At the best a nation determines its ethics roughly, hewing them savagely and unceremoniously out of the block; and there must be many imperfections, even when it is shapeliest to the eye. There is a natural tendency for organic things—creatures as well as the manifestations of creatures—to grow old and out of keeping with their environment. Not only so, but there must be added to this natural process which leads to decay the conservative forces of religion. By these powers is a people bound very rigidly to the rules of its forefathers, whereas there may be no proper correspondence between those laws and the tastes and requirements of the age. It is amazing sometimes to reflect how deeply we are moved by the inhibitions or permissions of a law long since past any usefulness and meet for the dust bin. And even when the incongruity of the law has become so apparent to the public sense that it is a matter of ridicule for the ordinary man, the difficulty of dislodging it from its ancient and venerable place is so great that few are found to attempt the thankless task, and many even to defend the absurdity. To take a trivial example: Some time since the visitors to a popular watering place complained that the authorities compelled the tobacconists to shut their shops on Sundays, whereas boatmen let out their boats, and cabmen their cabs unhindered. The law against Sunday trading still exists, yet it is never enforced because it is felt to be inconsistent with modern feeling. Even the authorities at the watering place of which I speak had but a half-hearted belief in the law, since they would illogically overlook its breaches in the case of some occupations. No one at present, however, proposes to abolish the law against Sunday trading with its statutory punishment, the stocks.

It is clear, then, that we must not look upon an existing code of morals as adequate or right merely because it has been of long standing and has been handed down to us by our fathers who found that it served their purpose. On the contrary, a perpetual readjustment is essential, whereby the anachronisms of the rule under which we live may be eliminated. There is an argument

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ready to the hand of any one who wishes to defend the existing conditions of society, an argument which, oddly enough, derives its force from the reasonings of Mr. Herbert Spencer. Mr. Spencer is so thoroughly committed to the cause of individualism that he would not interfere with the action of nature in regard to the main course of her developments. As he expresses it, the rule of the survival of the fittest must work freely in order to secure what nature requires; and this belief has led him to oppose with all the strength of his strong will the principles which lie at the base of socialism, if socialism (which is a vague term) be taken as the antithesis to individualism. That way, however, runs a return to the ancient dogma that whatever is is right. And it is easy to see how the argument may be employed in favor of the perfection of the ruling code of morals, or to speak more correctly, against any interference with that code. The error seems to me to lie in a confusion of mind which would dissociate the enthusiasms and yearnings of the human spirit from any relation with organic life. To the civilization of the middle ages with its inherent cruelties and superstitions arrives some prophet, who preaches a better way. It will hardly be seriously contended that the prophet has no right to interfere because he is interrupting the law of nature. He is part of nature himself and in consequence, in so far as he is effective in his crusade, the revolution of which he is the author is part of evolution. The same truth holds to-day, and those who can persuade the body of the nation out of an inveterate habit of belief are in no wise interfering with natural law. It is true, on the other hand, that if the popular will successfully resists, that result is again in keeping with the course which evolution has mapped out. The individualist, therefore, is at liberty to oppose the principles of socialism to the uttermost, but he is not at liberty to suggest that they are inconsistent with the purpose of nature, which not only is responsible for the elaboration of the world as we know it, but will have to determine the future of a world which we may not forecast. If socialism were to triumph—collectivism, horrid as is the word, is probably a more definite title—the triumph would mark a new and predestined stage in the world's history, a stage higher or lower, but still a stage in advance and on the road to something else. Surely, then, it comes to this, that we, all and each of us, may shout loudly for what we consider to be right,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that perhaps to none of us shall it be revealed whether what he has urged is good or bad, even if it be successful and secure the adherence of his neighbors.

If there is anything in the considerations which I have set down, all that is proved is surely this: that it is permissible to discuss the canons of current morality without fear and without prejudice. It is apparent that we have outgrown many of these, and it may be that we have developed beyond almost all. And I conceive that there is but one way to discover how little or how much we have gone astray; and that is as a preliminary to make out a definite standard of morals to which we may refer our rules and actions. To elaborate a serious code which should apply in detail to every available circumstance of life would be a far more ambitious task than this short paper designs. But I propose to endeavor to formulate a large principle of morals and to take a few examples thereafter as illustrations of its application, in the hope that this course may be suggestive, if nothing more. The correspondence of nature is so large and generous that we may forget it is also so careless and so cruel. We are fitted into our places with a rough hand; the largess of gifts is poured upon us; we are tended not unkindly, but with unparticularizing zeal. Nature gardens on so vast a scale that many grow up and many die, and there is no room in her heart for compassion for the dead. It is with the living that she is concerned, and most of all with those who, keeping nearest to her rude orders, draw therefrom a strong life. She rewards lavishly those who survive to do her credit. And the laws she has imposed form a body of morals which must be the basis of any successful ethical system.

This congruity of man with the laws and exactions of nature is the prime factor in determining his health and happiness. There is no room for any difference of opinion on this particular point. But it is more than that; there is a deeper significance in the proposition. A close observation of the progress of organic life in these terrestrial fields discovers two important facts: the one, that nature desires an advance upon lines of her own, such as she has achieved in aeons of the past; the other, that she benevolently rewards all acts and habits that assist such an advance. Kant proposed as a test of any action or system of ethics that we should consider this question: Could this be made a universal rule, applicable to all mankind? If this query were answerable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the affirmative, according to Kant the act or system might be taken as moral. Kant, however, wrote before the heyday of natural science, and wove his theories out of the fine-spun yarn of his brain. We stand upon firmer ground now through the offices of innumerable thinkers and patient observers, most of them long since dust and ashes with the German. Yet it is to the credit of that fine mind that the newer test does not wholly conflict with his own. It is, indeed, reconcilable with the older theory. For nature makes this postulate, that that must be deemed moral which, if applied at large, will consist with her schemes and tend to the general and particular advances at which she is aiming. Nature aims high, and the rewards of those who fall in with her aims is that they shall live healthily and happily. They that will not must pay the penalty, though the penalty may be long delayed, even till the third and fourth generation. The tragedy of life is that there is no account taken of individuals; it is the stream of tendency that matters. Fate waits so long and works so patiently that centuries elapse ere her results are seen. Yet it is certain that no man and no race of men may enter upon a conflict with nature with any hope of success. She has one end for such—extermination, or such oblivion as comes of inglorious decrepitude, of shameful degradation. The wages of sin against her is death; yet, as in the case of her rewards, she visits not always the individual. Whether she has penalties or benefits to offer, she prefers to deal with the race. It is the race that she pays and punishes most generously; it is the individual she tends to neglect. She pays him at once, after long years, not at all, as some careless employer who deals with large figures and great numbers, who in the "operation" of big transactions cannot be bothered with details.

According to this version of philosophy, then, morality is to be measured by the extent of our agreement with the plans of nature. The full design of those plans it is not possible to guess, yet, as we have seen, the general outline is deducible. But as a matter of fact a prevision of the future is not demanded of us, but only to obey definite rules which have dominated the processes of nature since we have been able to observe them. In the protrusion of man from the organic world a stage in evolution has been reached which, however magnificent, is not final. Life has sat down in a half-way house and presently shall resume its journey.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indeed, this is a mere figure of speech, as there is, and can be, no interruption in its course. The recklessness of the process by which the ultimate goal is to be gained can be gauged from the monstrous sacrifices it entails. No Juggernaut car rolled over living and sensible bodies so wantonly or so indifferently. For life and death are but the counters with which some vast game is played above us, beyond all, and seeming to these poor mortal eyes to be at once cruel and ineffectual. The material with which she is able to make her experiments is so rich and abundant that nature is spendthrift, neither hoards nor spares, and like a barbaric general will throw away innumerable pawns to gain her objective. What is death to us is but part of her game. So that the long reaches of history before history was recorded are dotted with the relics of myriads of experiments, myriads of failures, myriads of false types. Most of these creatures which were tentative essays towards the construction of man have perished long since; the survivors are even now diminishing; the fortune by which the human creature is at last placed dominant upon the earth and hunts the lower beasts to death marks only the culmination of that system of obliteration which nature has always reserved for her failures. The culmination? No. For the process, as I have said, is by no means at an end; and as man has been chosen from the ranks in which he once was merely a unit, so too from the gradually diverging races of man shall one be chosen to the exclusion of the others. Nature, in short, will continue to pick, and the best of us will still be chosen, as were the best of the anthropoid creatures at some long-distant point of time. There is here, no doubt, a lesson of vital consequence for the nations of the earth; but at the moment it is too large a question, and I am now considering rather morality in its relation to the internal economy of the state. Let us see how the rule which has been laid down will work out in one or two important particulars.

If we accept as a fact this demand on the part of nature (that is, of those forces which are developing the universe) that we must live in congruity with her, the acceptance necessitates a general and ruthless clearance of the laws, beliefs and customs which derive from other and alien rules. And it is unfortunate that the bulk of our morality and our public opinion is based upon other arguments, has come out of a remote past, and ven-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erable by such descent wears yet the scars and patches of long service. The common sense of generation after generation has shaped these bonds about the race, both visible and invisible, into some practical agreement with the changing civilization. Yet the liberties taken with these laws and customs have been slight, and have indeed been limited to such modifications as conserved an appearance of harmony and prevented a monstrous antagonism between public law and public sentiment. Perhaps in no way has the inheritance of erroneous traditions, inconsistent with what I have called the proper base of morality, been more pernicious than in determining the relative values of death and pain. The common opinion of the day tends to assert that, whereas death is an evil to be avoided, pain is a discipline, a means of education, an ultimate good. The verdict of natural morality is the reverse; for while nature offers to us death as a refuge, as the final grave of our troubles, she abhors pain and spares us what she may. Indeed, that gift of death is for the release from pain and is made in a kindly spirit. She has no further use for us; we are broken and done with. Very well; there is left that irrevocable silence in which neither will the mind revolve upon itself with interminable sadness, nor the nerves and sinews throb and ache in that quiet heap of corrupting dust.

The aim of Christianity has been to transfigure death; to represent that last act in which the living body takes part as a radiant change which the soul is right to anticipate with longing and to welcome with gladness. In that restitution which will characterize a celestial life the Christian religion sees the justification and the explanation of this bewildering sojourn on earth. And death, thus interpreted and so glorified, should be to Christians nothing but a blessing, a gift, a gate out of all sorrows. Yet it cannot be said with any truth that modern sentiment regards it in this light. The growth of pity has increased with it the fear of death, and it is probable that man's faith is not now so vivid or so strong as to prevail against the terrors which have been sedulously fostered in his heart for generations. For death itself is nothing; it is the shadow of death that terrifies. "I have seen many men die," said a well-known doctor, "and after thirty years I have come to the conclusion that it hurts about as much as being born." And there is what I would come to; for it is pain and only pain that matters, whether pain be mental or physical.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When I claim death as a positive benefit for the individual I am not doing so out of a wanton fancy for a paradox. For so long as life is good, so long, that is, as the balance is in favor of happiness, for so long will death remain an unnecessary evil. And even beyond that stage, when the scales have kicked the beam and there seems surely no more to wait for in this world, even then hope steps in and stays the desperate hand. The future which is unknown is always more vast and more possible than the past which is familiar; and out of that illusive void the human spirit will bravely shape promises for itself until the crisis is past and the scale returns to balance. The aim of the life, if it would do what nature desires for it, should be the avoidance of pain and the acceptance of death in due season. A proper system of morals should educate us for this end. The scheme of philosophy in which pain is regarded as a disciplinary force and, therefore, a blessing seems to me by the light of these principles to be as false as that which would terrify us with the shadow of death. Nature desires a happy life, for it is only by full living that the creatures which she is molding can be improved. As for pain, it has been established undoubtedly in the interests of the creature, and not for his punishment or discipline. Pain is a very blunt signal of danger which is meant as a guide. The nerves which conduct that sensation to the centre of feeling lie for the most part upon the surface where they may the more easily give warning. To scrape the surface of the flesh hurts more than to cut deeply into the tissues. There is, therefore, no moral or philosophic use of pain in all this. It is a practical contrivance of the most ordinary utility, and the less occasion human creatures, or any other creatures, have to experience it the better for them. By that conservation of placid happiness is the fulness of life consummated. In truth, if we are looking about for a philosophy, that in which the greatest amount of unnecessary pain is averted would seem to be, on the whole, the highest and best we may obtain. The rule of the savage world is framed upon a different postulate, and even the practice of the civilized territories partakes of that ancient tradition of cruelty. It is likely that the active taste for cruelty has been evolved among races by accident from some condition which at one time served a useful purpose in the body politic. According to the scheme of nature no unnecessary infliction of pain was admissible, yet incidentally a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

positive taste for pain has developed; and it is possible that the tortures of the red Indians may be parallel with the ruthless treatment of the mouse by the cat. The desire to avenge a wrong was, doubtless, quite necessary in the original and rudimentary society, since only by such wild instincts was the society capable of being preserved. Yet we have now outlived that period and entrusted our quarrels to the placid hands of the law. Justice, nevertheless, remains vindictive and is directed in many cases not to the utilitarian end of preventing crime, but to the barbarous object of avenging it. At the same time the sentimental theory of life, which would underestimate the effects of pain and exalt death to the heights of tragedy, is busy amongst us. These dual principles go right through our criminal law. For example, a lunatic who commits a murder is confined during His Majesty's pleasure, whereas a man of sound intelligence is hanged. According to a saner view the lunatic would be hanged (or otherwise disposed of) along with the ordinary criminal. Again, there are many things worse than the infliction of death. If a man should be killed to-day, it would entail less suffering than if he should lie racked on a bed of pain for years or find his strength and health ebb from him step by step, or, once more, than if he should be subject to the exactions and terrors of blackmail over a term of years. But public opinion and the law will not recognize that blackmail, or, say, adulteration of food and wine, are as heinous offenses as murder. The bare fact is that they are far worse judged from the standpoint I have indicated. They are the cause of *greater pain*. There is in Great Britain and elsewhere a vigorous minority which agitates for the abolition of capital punishment, on the ground that it is merely a survival of barbarism to take life in exchange for life. The question of capital punishment, however, will scarcely be determined on such grounds. Any one may suspect that the movement has its origin rather in a sentimental dread of death. In Italy, where the capital penalty is abolished, a far worse (and a more costly) punishment awaits the assassin, who is confined solitary in a cell until his reason is endangered. Of the two retributions there can be no doubt which is the more severe; yet the object of society should be to restrain a dangerous man from homicide—an object which would be most easily attained by his execution. The infliction of pain is unnecessary; the extinction of death is desirable. The law acts as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if the reverse were true. We may take it that the law rarely intervenes to spare pain, but invariably to protect from death and the loss of property. Being derived from a more primitive society it is not adjusted to our later needs and higher requirements and the conservative character of society maintains and defends the incongruity.

The round world is built upon a series of conventions which are crumbling and decayed, but are still held sacred; yet there is no hope that we may better this condition by the aid of the "faddist." What are we to do with the vegetarian who denies the right of the *carnivore* to take the life of the lower animals? He is fitted with teeth which give the lie to his own arguments, yet he will persist in regarding that as cruel which is only the behest of a dispassionate nature. One particular form of cruelty practiced by law and custom in our occidental civilization is the refusal to allow a man to command his own life. He may do what he will with his property, he may even to a large limit deal with his children as he will, but to be the master of his own life is forbidden him. That which is drawn reluctant and unconscious out of an abysmal past may not have the privilege of laying down that gift which it has never sought, but is bound reluctant to a reluctant and ungracious world when every bond between them is broken and dissolved. There exists still that most barbarous usage by which a coroner's jury has the choice of two verdicts upon a suicide, and one of these pronounces that he who has preferred death deliberately is matter for anathema—should be treated as carrion and denied all kindly offices and rites. Yet surely the desire of death must be so unnatural that to seek it must of itself prove life to be intolerable. Nature has no need of those who find life too difficult. The very fact should engage her assistance in parting the slender links, and the nausea of life which comes to some in certain conditions is, no doubt, intended as the prelude and incentive to the final relief. Of course, I am considering not a mere whim on the part of any emotional person, but a settled state of mind, deliberate and definite. There are hospitals in every civilized community; there are workhouses. Is it beyond the dreams of kindness that there should also be a House of Death, a hostelry into which those weary of the world or themselves should be received as into a lodging against the darkness, a halfway house to the eternal silence? A proper course of care and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discipline might fitly serve as a test between those who have real ground for their dislike of life and those who have jumped lightly at a release which they do not need. Yet there is a class of suffering which receives even less consideration at the hands of our merciless humanity than that which would culminate in suicide from weariness of life or complexity of outlook. I refer to cases of incurable and painful disease. It is satisfactory that medical skill is able in these days to mitigate the pains of such as are afflicted with these, yet it would be more consistent with natural justice and morality that they should have the power of terminating their own sufferings by death. A consultation, very grave and solemn, the consent of the sufferer—these might well be the prelude to swift and painless euthanasia.

The purblindness of law and custom to the claims of real justice and kindness is marked in many aspects of our modern life. False ideals, which are false idols, still rule our habits, our thoughts and our consciences. *Genus infelix humanum,* we are unable to throw off that old ancestral yoke under which we have been bowed so long that we are even unaware of the subjugation. The Anglo-Saxon race is in the main a just race in its dealings, desirous of the right, and following what seem the dictates of duty. A little cold and unimaginative, more than a little patient, this northern blood so felicitously fused in the course of history has derived from its stock a belief in the rights of others as well as a dependence on its own judgments. Both that fairness and that obstinacy are rooted deeply in our nature, and the two qualities, clashing as they not infrequently do, produce in our national character strange inconsistencies. It is by reason of this that we are wrongly charged with hypocrisy by foreign critics. We are not hypocrites, but only a trifle unimaginative and a good deal more conservative in our ways. It is an anomaly traceable to the conflict I have mentioned that in England to-day the tenderest consideration for the animal world co-exists with the most brutal disregard of animal sufferings. The death of a cat or dog, adequately related, will cause emotion in the hearts of the audience; yet some of these may run behind hounds to-morrow, and unblushingly accept the tail of an unhappy victim. The outcry against bull-fights on the Continent seems at once amazing and amusing to those who have witnessed the terror, exhaustion and despair of the hunted quarry in the national sport of Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land. In that moment of its final agony it is probable that the fox suffers the extreme of suffering that the animal world is capable of. Cock-fighting has been abolished, and yet it is quite clear that the cocks at least did not object to the duel, whereas hare and fox certainly cannot be said to enjoy the chase. In brief, to bring these remarks in line with the thesis, the sports are not put to the test of pain, which is the only test of importance, which is indeed the one test exacted by nature.

The dullness of the human mind to the importance of pain and the insignificance of death is very manifest in our attitude to the crimes of murder and dishonesty, to which I have already referred. If we judge by the test of pain, we must revise our code of crimes and penalties; for that will not seem the worst offense which really is so. More harm is wrought by dishonesty than by a solitary act of violence which results in death. The swindler, the rascally operator in stocks, the purveyor of bad food, the adulterator, the cheating contractor, the landlord who avoids his responsibilities, the dishonest plumber—all these are the cause of far greater suffering than the man who shoots his comrade in angry brawl. Yet we are unwilling to accept this as the case, and it is probable that many generations will come and go before the law and the sanctions of the law are applied upon this first principle. The history of the past will, no doubt, be repeated in the history of the future. The course of evolution is forward always, is not dammed even when it appears so, and we are at this moment undergoing a change "into something rich and strange." One property of the social state which the new creature will inhabit will certainly be a higher morality. It is not so very long ago—the middle ages—that the wanton destruction of life was scarcely considered as a crime. It was no doubt very stupid and unnecessary for a lord to shoot his serfs or bondmen, but neither law nor moral sense regarded this act as a heinous offense. With the passage of centuries the crime of murder has grown in blackness, not only to the eye of justice but to the popular sense. Consequently an inherent and abiding instinct against murder has been developed in the conscience of the northern nations at any rate. It is reasonable to expect that a similar course of development will be followed in the case of other offenses against society. The appreciation of the importance of pain in a system of morals has dawned upon us late, and has required subtler senses. If we

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

once recognize that pain is the immortal enemy and that the battle must be waged against it, and if we are able to adjust our minds so that we see death in a proper perspective, we shall be on the highway to a better moral system and a happier social state. The victories of the past have been great and arduously achieved and they were won by those who were scarcely conscious that they were struggling, who certainly were ignorant of the end for which they fought. Peace is not yet, for peace is when change ceases, and change may never cease "'till all change end." So we may be encouraged by the past in the future, and if we may fix however roughly upon the goal to which nature desires to direct our footsteps, that ideal in our minds may serve to help us and the great cause of human progress.

H. B. MARRIOTT-WATSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ANTICIPATIONS: AN EXPERIMENT IN PROPHECY.—V.

BY H. G. WELLS.

VII. THE CONFLICT OF LANGUAGES.

We have brought together thus far in these Anticipations the material for the picture of a human community in the year 2000. We have imagined its roads, the type and appearance of its homes, its social developments, its internal struggle for organization. We have speculated upon its moral and æsthetic conditions, read its newspaper, made an advanced criticism upon the lack of universality in its literature, and attempted to imagine it at war. We have decided in particular that unlike the civilized community of the immediate past, which lived either in sharply defined towns or agriculturally over a wide country, this population will be distributed in a quite different way, a little more thickly over vast urban regions and a little less thickly over less attractive or less convenient or less industrial parts of the world. And in all that has been written there has appeared an unavoidable assumption that the coming community will be vast, something geographically more extensive than most and geographically different from almost all existing communities; that the outline its creative forces will draw not only does not coincide with existing political centres and boundaries, but will be more often than not in direct conflict with them, uniting areas that are separated and separating areas that are united, grouping here half a dozen tongues and peoples together and there tearing apart homogeneous bodies and distributing the fragments among separate groups. And it will now be well to enquire a little into the general causes of these existing divisions, the political boundaries of to-day, and the still older contours of language and race.

It is first to be remarked that each of these sets of boundaries is superimposed, as it were, on the older sets. The race areas, for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

example, which are now not traceable in Europe at all, must have represented old regions of separation. The language areas which have little or no essential relation to racial distribution have also given way long since to the newer forces that have united and consolidated nations. And the still newer forces that have united and separated the nineteenth century states have been, and in many cases are still, in manifest conflict with "national" ideas.

In the original separation of human races, in the subsequent differentiation and spread of languages, in the separation of men into nationalities, and in the union and splitting of states and empires we have to deal essentially with the fluctuating manifestation of the same fundamental shaping factor which will determine the distribution of urban districts in the coming years—*transit*. Every boundary of the ethnographical, linguistic, political and commercial map—as a little consideration will show—has been traced in the first place by the means of transit under the compulsion of geographical contours.

There are evident in Europe four or five or more very distinct racial types, and since the methods and rewards of barbaric warfare and the nature of the chief chattels of barbaric trade have always been diametrically opposed to racial purity, their original separation could only have gone on through such an entire lack of communication as to have prevented either trade or warfare between the bulk of the differentiating bodies. These original racial types are now inextricably mingled. Unobservant, overscholarly people talk or write in the profoundest manner about a Teutonic race and a Keltic race and institute all sorts of curious contrasts between these phantoms, but these are not races at all, if physical characteristics have anything to do with race. The Dane, the Bavarian, the Prussian, the Frieslander, the Wessex peasant, the Kentish man, the Virginian, the man from New Jersey, the Norwegian, the Swede and the Transvaal Boer are generalized, for example, as Teutonic; while the short, dark, cunning sort of Welshman, the tall and generous Highlander, the miscellaneous Irish, the square-headed Breton and any sort of Cornwall peasant are Kelts within the meaning of this oil-lamp anthropology.* People who believe in this sort of thing are not

*Under the intoxication of the Keltic renaissance the most diverse sorts of human beings have foregathered and met face to face and been photographed collectively, and have, no doubt, gloated over these collective photographs, without any of them realizing, it seems, what a miscellaneous thing the Keltic race must be. There is nothing that may or may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sort of people that one attempts to convert by a set argument. One need only say the thing is not so; there is no Teutonic race, and there never has been; there is no Keltic race, and there never has been. No one has ever proved or attempted to prove the existence of such races; the thing has always been assumed; they are dogmas with nothing but questionable authority behind them, and the *onus* of proof rests on the believer. This nonsense about Keltic and Teutonic is no more science than Lombroso's extraordinary assertions about criminals or palmistry or the development of religion from a solar myth. Indisputably there are several races intermingled in the European populations —I am inclined to suspect the primitive European races may be found to be so distinct as to resist confusion—but there is no inkling of a satisfactory analysis yet that will designate what these races were and define them in terms of physical and moral character. The fact remains that there is no such thing as a racially pure and homogeneous community in Europe distinct from other communities. Even among the Jews, according to Erckert and Chantre and J. Jacobs, there are markedly divergent types. There may have been two original elements and there have been extensive local intermixtures.

But long before the beginnings of history, while even language was in its first beginnings, these first complete isolations were breaking down again, the little pools of race were running together into less homogeneous lagoons and marshes of humanity, the first paths were being worn—war paths for the most part. Still differentiation would be largely at work. Without frequent intercourse, frequent interchange of women as the great factor in that intercourse, the tribes and bands of mankind would still go on separating, would develop dialectic and customary, if not physical and moral, differences. It was no longer a case of pools perhaps, but they were still in lakes. There were as yet no open seas of mankind. With advancing civilization, with iron weapons and war disciplines, with established paths and a social rule, and presently with the coming of the horse, what one might call the areas of assimilation would increase in size. A stage would be reached when the only checks to transit of a sufficiently convenient sort to keep language uniform would be the sea or

not be a Kelt; and I know, for example, professional Kelts who are, so far as face, manners, accent, morals and ideals go, indistinguishable from other people who are, I am told, indisputably Assyroid Jews.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mountains or a broad river or—pure distance. And presently the rules of the game, so to speak, would be further altered and the unifactions and isolations that were establishing themselves upset altogether and brought into novel conflict by the beginning of navigation, whereby an impassable barrier became a highway.

The commencement of actual European history coincides with the closing phases of what was probably a very long period of a foot and (occasional) horseback state of communications, the adjustments so arrived at being already in an early state of rearrangement through the advent of the ship. The communities of Europe were still for the larger part small, isolated tribes and kingdoms, such kingdoms as a mainly pedestrian militia might hold together. The increase of transit facilities between such communities, by the development of shipping and the invention of the wheel and the made road, spelt for a time increased trade, but very speedily a more extensive form of war, and in the end either union through the wearing away of differences or conquest. Man is the creature of a struggle for existence, incurably egoistic and aggressive. Convince him even of the gospel of self-abnegation and he instantly becomes its zealous missionary, taking great credit that his expedients to ram it into the minds of his fellow-creatures do not include physical force—and if that is not self-abnegation, he asks, what is? So he has been and so he is likely to remain. Not to be so is to die of abnegation and extinquish the type. Improvement in transit between communities, formerly for all practical purposes isolated, means, always has meant, and always will mean that now they can get at one another. And they do. They interbreed and fight, physically, mentally and spiritually. Unless Providence is belied in its works, that is what they are meant to do.

A third invention which though not a means of transit like the wheeled vehicle and the ship was yet a means of communication and rendered still larger political reactions possible, and that was the development of systems of writing. The first empires and some sort of written speech arose together. Just as a kingdom as distinguished from a mere tribal group of villages is almost impossible without horses, so is an empire without writing and post roads. The history of the whole world for three thousand years is the history of a unity larger than the small kingdom of the heptarchy type endeavoring to establish itself under

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the stress of these discoveries of horse traffic and shipping and the written word, the history of the partial shattering of the barriers that had been effectual enough to prevent the fusion of more than tribal communities through all the long ages.

East of the Gobi Pamir barrier there has slowly grown up under these new conditions the Chinese system. West and north of the Sahara Gobi barrier of deserts and mountains the extraordinarily strong and spacious conceptions of the Romans succeeded in dominating the world, and do indeed dominate it to this hour in a sort of mutilated way by the powers of great words and wide ideas in Cæsarism and Imperialism, in the titles of Czar, Kaiser and Imperator, in Papal pretension and countless political devices. For awhile these conceptions did actually sustain a united and organized Empire over much of this space. But at its stablest time this union was no more than a political union, the spreading of a thin layer of Latin-speaking officials, of a thin network of roads and a very thin veneer of customs and refinements. It checked, perhaps, but it nowhere succeeded in stopping the slow but inevitable differentiation of province from province and nation from nation. The forces of transit that permitted the Roman imperialism and its partial successors to establish wide ascendencies were not sufficient to carry the resultant unity beyond the political stage. There was unity but not unification. Tongues and writing ceased to be pure without ceasing to be distinct. Sympathies, religious and social practices, ran apart and rounded themselves off like drops of oil on water. Travel was restricted to the rulers, troops and a wealthy leisure class. Commerce was for most of the constituent provinces of the empire a commerce in superficialities, and each province (except for Italy, which latterly became dependent on an overseas food supply) was in all essential things autonomous, could have continued in existence, rulers and rules, arts, luxuries and refinements just as they stood, if all other lands and customs had been swept out of being. Local convulsions and revolutions, conquests and developments occurred indeed; but though the stones were altered, the mosaic remained, and the general size and character of its constituent pieces remained. So it was under the Romans; so it was in the eighteenth century; and so it would probably have remained as long as the post road and the sailing ship were the most rapid forms of transit within the reach of man. Wars and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers and princes came and went; that was all. Nothing was changed. There was only one state the more or less. Even in the eighteenth century the process of real unification had effected so little that not one of the larger kingdoms of Europe escaped a civil war—not a class war, but a really *internal* war—between one part of itself and another, in that hundred years. In spite of Rome's few centuries of unstable empire, internal wars, a perpetual struggle against finally triumphant disruption, seemed to be the unavoidable destiny of every power that attempted to rule over a larger radius than at most a hundred miles.

So evident was this that many educated English persons thought then, and many who are not in the habit of analysing operating causes still think to-day, that the wide diffusion of the English-speaking people is a mere preliminary to their political, social and linguistic disruption, that linguistic differences, differences of custom, costume, prejudice and the like will finally make the Australian, the Canadian of English blood, the Virginian and the English Africander as incomprehensible and unsympathetic one to another as Spaniard and Englishman, or Frenchman and German are now. On such a supposition all our current Imperialism is the most foolish defiance of the inevitable, the maddest waste of blood, treasure and emotion that man ever made. So it might be, and would be, if it were not that the epoch of post road and sailing-ship is at an end. We are in the beginning of a new time with such forces of organization and unification at work in mechanical traction, in the telephone and telegraph, in a whole wonderland of novel, space-destroying appliance and in the correlated inevitable advance in practical education, as the world has never felt before.

The operation of these unifying forces is already to be very distinctly traced in the check, the arrest indeed, of any further differentiation in existing tongues, even in the most widely spread. In fact, it is more than an arrest. The forces of differentiation have been driven back and an actual process of assimilation has set in. In England at the commencement of the nineteenth century the common man of Somerset and the common man of Yorkshire, the Sussex peasant, the Caithness cottar and the common Ulsterman would have been almost incomprehensible to one another. They differed in accent, in idiom and in their very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

names for things. They differed in their ideas about things. They were, in plain English, foreigners one to another. Now they differ only in accent, and even that is a dwindling difference. Their language has become ampler because now they read. They read books—or, at any rate, they learn to read out of books—and certainly they read newspapers and those scrappy periodicals that people, like bishops, pretend to think so detrimental to the human mind—periodicals that it is cheaper to make at centres and uniformly than locally in accordance with local needs. Since the newspaper cannot fit the locality, the locality has to broaden its mind to the newspaper and to ideas acceptable in other localities. The word and the idiom of the literary language and the pronunciation suggested by its spelling tends to prevail over the local usage. And, moreover, there is a persistent mixing of peoples going on, migration in search of employment and so on, unprecedented before the railways came. So few people are content to remain in that locality and state of life "into which it has pleased God to call them!" As a result, dialectic purity has vanished; dialects are rapidly vanishing, and novel differentiations are stunted or arrested altogether. Such novelties as do establish themselves in a locality are widely disseminated almost at once in books and periodicals.

A parallel arrest of dialectic separation has happened in France, in Italy, in Germany and in the United States. It is not a process peculiar to any one nation. It is simply an aspect of the general process that has arisen out of mechanical locomotion. The organization of elementary education has no doubt been an important factor, but the essential influence working through this circumstance is the fact that paper is relatively cheap to typesetting, and both cheap to authorship—even the commonest sorts of authorship—and the wider the area a periodical or books serves, the bigger, more attractive and better it can be made for the same money. Evidently this process of assimilation will continue. Even local differences of accent seem likely to follow. The itinerant dramatic company, the itinerant preacher, the coming extension of telephones and the phonograph, which at any time in some application to correspondence or instruction may cease to be a toy—all these things attack, or threaten to attack, the weeds of differentiation before they can take root.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And this process is not restricted to dialects merely. The native of a small country who knows no other language than his own becomes increasingly at a disadvantage in comparison with the user of any of the three great languages of the Europeanized world. For his literatures he depends on the scanty writers who are in his own case and write or have written in his own tongue. Necessarily they are few, because with a small public there can be only subsistence for a few. For his science he is in a worse case. His country can produce neither teachers nor discoverers to compare with the numbers of such workers in the larger areas, and it will neither pay them to write original matter for his instruction nor to translate what has been written in other tongues. The larger the number of people reading a tongue, the larger—other things being equal—will be the output of more or less original literature in that tongue, and the more profitable and numerous will be translations of whatever has value in other tongues.

Moreover, the larger the reading public is in any language, the cheaper will it be to supply copies of the desired work. In the matter of current intelligence the case of the speaker of the small language is still worse. His newspaper will need to be cheaply served, his home intelligence will be cut and restricted, his foreign news belated and second hand. To travel even a little distance or to conduct anything but the smallest business enterprise will be exceptionally inconvenient to him. The Englishman who knows no language but his own may travel well nigh all over the world and everywhere meet some one who can speak his tongue. But what of the Welsh-speaking Welshman? What of the Basque or the Lithuanian who can speak only his mother tongue? Everywhere such a man is a foreigner and with all the foreigner's disadvantages. In most places he is for all practical purposes deaf and dumb.

The inducements to an Englishman, Frenchman or German to become bi-lingual are great enough nowadays, but the inducements to a speaker of the smaller languages are rapidly approaching compulsion. He must do it in self-defense. To be an educated man in his own vernacular has become an impossibility. He must either become a mental subject of one of the greater languages, or sink to the intellectual status of a peasant. But if our analysis of social development was correct, the peasant of to-day will be represented to-morrow by the people of no account

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whatever, the classes of extinction, the people of the Abyss. If that analysis was correct, the essential nation will be all of educated men, that is to say, the essential nation will speak some dominant language or cease to exist, whatever its primordial tongue may have been. It will pass out of being and become a mere local area of the lower social stratum.

This action of the force of attraction of the great tongues is cumulative. It goes on, as bodies fall, with a steady acceleration. The more the great tongues prevail over the little languages the less will be the inducement to write and translate into these latter, the less the inducement to master them with any care or precision. And so this attack upon the smaller tongues, this gravitation of those who are born to speak them towards the great languages is not only to be seen going on in the case of such languages as Flemish, Welsh or Basque, but even in the case of Norwegian and of such a great and noble tongue as the Italian I am afraid that the trend of things makes for a similar suppression. All over Italy is the French newspaper and the French book. French wins its way more and more there, as English, I understand, is doing in Norway and English and German in Holland. And in the coming years when the reading public in the case of the Western nations will be practically the whole functional population, when travel will be more extensive and abundant, and the interchange of printed matter still cheaper and swifter—and, above all, with the spread of the telephone—the process of subtle, bloodless, unpremeditated annexation will progress much more rapidly even than it does at present. The twentieth century will see the effectual crowding out of most of the weaker languages—if not a positive crowding out yet at least (as in Flanders) a supplementing of them by the superposition of one or the other of a limited number of world-languages over the area in which each is spoken. This will go on not only in Europe, but with varying rates of progress and local eddies and interruptions over the whole world. Except in the special case of China and Japan, where there may be a unique development, the peoples of the world will only escape from the wreckage of their too small and swamped and foundering social systems up the ladders of what one may call the aggregating tongues.

What will these aggregating world languages be? If one has regard only to its extension during the nineteenth century

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one may easily incline to overrate the probabilities of English becoming the chief of these. But a great part of the vast extension of English that has occurred has been due to the rapid reproduction of originally English-speaking peoples, the emigration of foreigners into English-speaking countries in quantities too small to resist the contagion about them and the compulsion due to the political and commercial preponderance of a people too illiterate to readily master strange tongues. None of these causes have any essential permanence. When one comes to look more closely into the question, one is surprised to discover how slow the extension of English has been in the face of apparently far less convenient tongues. English still fails to replace the French language in French Canada, and its ascendency is doubtful to-day in South Africa after nearly a century of British dominion. It has none of the contagious quality of French, and the small class that monopolizes the direction of British affairs has never displayed any great zeal to propagate its use. Of the few ideas possessed by the British governing class the destruction and discouragement of schools and colleges is unfortunately one of the chief, and there is an absolute incapacity to understand the political significance of the language question. The Hindoo who is at pains to learn and use English encounters something uncommonly like hatred disguised in a facetious form. He will certainly read little about himself in English that is not grossly contemptuous. The possibilities that have existed, and that do still in a dwindling degree exist, for resolute statesmen to make English the common language of communication for all Asia south and east of the Himalayas will have to develop of their own force, or dwindle and pass away. They may pass away entirely. There is no sign that either the English or the Americans have a sufficient sense of the importance of linguistic predominance in the future of their race to interfere with natural processes in this matter for many years to come.

Among peoples not actually subject to British or American rule, and who are neither waiters nor commercial travellers, the inducements to learn English rather than French or German do not increase. If our initial assumptions are right, the decisive factor in this matter is the amount of science and thought the acquisition of a language will afford the man who learns it. It becomes therefore a fact of very great significance that the actual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number of books published in English is less than that in French or German, and that the proportion of serious books is very greatly less. A large proportion of English books are novels adapted to the minds of women, or of boys and superannuated business men, stories designed rather to allay than stimulate thought. They are the only books indeed that are profitable to publisher and author alike. In this connection they do not count, however; no foreigner is likely to learn English for the pleasure of reading Miss Marie Corelli in the original or of drinking subtle elements from The Helmet of Navarre.

These things, if they were merely the grievances of the study, might very well rest there. But they must be recognized here because the intellectual decline of the published literature of the English language (using the word to cover all sorts of books) involves the decline of the language and of all the spacious political possibilities that go with the wide extension of a language. If in the coming years a deliberate attempt were made to provide sound instruction in English to all who sought it, and if the present sordid trade of publishing were so lifted as to bring the whole literature, the whole science and all the contemporary thought of the world within the reach, need and desire of every man who had the franchise of the tongue, then by the year 2000 I would prophesy that the whole functional body of human society would read and perhaps even write and speak our language. And in a fair way to be the universal language of mankind. But such an enterprise demands a resolution and an intelligence beyond all the immediate signs of the times. It implies a veritable renaissance of intellectual life among the English-speaking peoples. The probabilities of such a renaissance will be more conveniently discussed at a later stage when we attempt to draw the broad outline of the struggle for world-wide ascendency that the coming years will see. But here it is clear that upon the probability of such a renaissance depends the extension of the language; and not only that, but the preservation of that military and naval efficiency upon which in this world of resolute aggression the existence of the English-speaking communities finally depends.

French and German will also be aggregating languages during the greater portion of the coming years. Of the two I am inclined to think French will spread further than German. There is a disposition in the world, which the French share, to grossly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

undervalue the prospects of all things French, derived, so far as I can gather, from the facts that the French were beaten by the Germans in 1870, and that they do not breed with the abandon of rabbits or negroes. These are considerations that affect the dissemination of French very little. The French reading public is something different and very much larger than the existing political French system. The number of books published in French is greater than that published in English, there is a critical reception for a work published in French that is one of the few things worth a writer's having, and the French translators are the most alert and efficient in the world. One has only to see a Parisian bookshop and to recall an English one to realize the standing of French. The serried ranks of lemon-colored volumes in the former have the whole range of human thought and interest. There are no taboos and no limits. You have everything up and down the scale from frank indecency to stark wisdom. It is a shop for men. I remember my amazement on discovering three copies of a translation of that most wonderful book, the Text Book of Psychology of Professor William James, in a shop in L'Avenue de l'Opera—three copies of a book that I have never seen anywhere in England outside my own house. And the French books are all so pleasant in the page and so cheap; they are for a people that buys to read. One thinks of the English bookshop, with its gaudy reach-me-downs of gilded and embossed cover, its horribly printed novels still more horribly "illustrated," the exasperating pointless variety in the size and thickness of its books. The general effect of the English book is that it is something sold by a dealer in bric-a-brac, honestly sorry the thing *is* a book, but who has anyhow done *his* best to remedy it! And all the English shopful is brand new fiction or illustrated travel (of "Buns with the Grand Lama" type), or gilded versions of the classics of past times done up to give away. While the French bookshop reeks of contemporary life.

These things count for French as against English now, and they will count for infinitely more in the coming years. And over German also French has many advantages. In spite of the numerical preponderance of books published in Germany, it is doubtful if the German reader has such a catholic feast before him as the reader of French. There is a mass of German fiction probably as uninteresting to a foreigner as popular English

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and American romance. And German compared with French is an unattractive language; unmelodious, unwieldy and cursed with a hideous and blinding lettering that the German is too patriotic to sacrifice. The indigenous German technicality remains clumsy and compromised by its everyday relations. And the shade of meaning, the limited qualification, that a Frenchman or Englishman can attain with a mere twist of the sentence, the German must either abandon or laboriously overstate with some colossal wormcast of parenthesis. Against the German tongue there are hostile frontiers; there are hostile people who fear German preponderance and who have set their hearts against its use. In Roumania and among the Slav, Bohemian and Hungarian peoples French attacks German in the flank and has a clear prospect of predominance.

But when one turns to China there are the strangest possibilities. It is in Eastern Asia alone that there seems to be any possibility of a synthesis sufficiently great to maintain itself outside of the interlocked system of mechanically sustained societies that is developing from mediæval Christendom. Throughout Eastern Asia there is still a vast wilderness of languages, but over them all rides the Chinese writing. And very strong—strong enough to be gravely considered—is the possibility of that writing taking up an orthodox association of sounds and becoming a world speech. The Japanese written language, the language of Japanese literature, tends to assimilate itself to Chinese, and fresh Chinese words and expressions are continually taking root in Japan. The Japanese are a people abnormal and incalculable, with a touch of romance, a conception of honor, a quality of imagination and a clearness of intelligence that renders possible for them things inconceivable of any other existing people. I may be the slave of perspective effects, but when I turn my mind from the petty-fogging muddle of the English House of Commons, for example, that magnified vestry that is so proud of itself as a club—when I turn from that to this race of brave and smiling people destiny seems to begin drawing with a bolder hand. In front and rear of China the English language stands. It has the start of all other languages, the mechanical advantage, the position. If only we could make up our minds that it should stand for something irresistibly worth having!

H. G. WELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ITALIAN VIEW OF HUMOR.*

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

(First Paper.)

THE jolly frankness of the author's own phrase can best give a notion of the amiable book by Signor Paolo Bellezza, which has lately come to my hand from Italy, and which I should like to make the excuse for a few words of my own on the matter it treats of. He quotes a countryman of his who says, of another work, "This book is not made out of books," and then he adds, "Of this work of mine I must confess exactly the contrary; it is made exclusively out of books; it is a great lot of stuff gathered from everywhere except from my brain. . . . It is a necklace of pearls strung upon a slender cord; that, I have put there; the pearls have been furnished me by the most famous jewelers, native and foreign. This said, I can—without being accused of pride—recommend it to my respectable customers as an article of great value and of absolute novelty." It is for his reviewer to protest that the stringer of the pearls undervalues the slender cord, which is no inanimate string, but a sensitive nerve, alive with fine sympathy for the pearls it holds together. The book is indeed mainly a compilation, but a compilation infused with the taste, the intelligence, and the cultivation of the compiler, who is, perhaps, only just to himself in claiming that it is "the first study treating of humor with a certain amplitude, and in its multiple forms and manifestations," and who is surely right in hoping "that it may prove acceptable at least as an attempt in the direction that such a study ought to take." I will say even more for him (unless it should be saying less), and add that among his many saws and instances, his saws are some-

*Paola Bellezza. "Humour." Strenna a Beneficio del Pio Istituto dei Rachitici. Milano. 1900.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

times the best; the nerve is finer than the message it carries, the cord more precious than the pearl. But undoubtedly most readers will find pleasure in his book because of the instances, though they should all the more, therefore, be admonished to regard the saws.

I.

Signor Bellezza treats by precept and example, in a series of fifteen chapters, of what humor is and is not; of the essence of humor; of humorous wisdom; of humorous illustrations taken from Dickens; of humorous sensibility; of the ugly phases of humor; of humorous motives; of the whims of humorists; of the psychology of the humorist; of the humorous view of shipwreck, earthquake, misery, famine and cannibalism; of mad and anomalous humor; of grisly humor, concerning murders, suicides and executions; of humor in art; of the balance of humor in modern literature; of the classic home of humor. In all these chapters he practices such sane restraint in the selection of his proofs that he can rarely be accused of what may be called Lombrosoism; but, when accused, he cannot be wholly acquitted of it. This is not so heinous in a countryman of Lombroso's, but it is something to warn the reader of, and it will be well to weigh the evidences which Signor Bellezza accumulates with such a generous, I will not say indiscriminate, hand.

Certainly he cannot be blamed with profusion, with a weak prodigality which is finally not hospitality, in providing examples of humor from the writings of his own people. He not merely confesses, but he protests with groans and sighs of rejection that there is no humor in the "Divina Commedia," as some Italian critics seem fondly to have claimed; and apparently he does not find it in his scheme to dwell long upon the Bernesque poets, who were unquestionably among the earliest of the modern humorists, though we now find it as hard to laugh at Berni, and Ariosto, and Pulci, and the author of the "Rape of the Bucket," as we do at Shakespeare when Shakespeare means to be funniest. He draws most upon Manzoni, and rightly, as I think every lover of humor will own, in recalling the delicious character of Don Abbondio in "I Promessi Sposi"; but he scarcely does justice to Giusti, among the modern poets, or to that school of comic dramatists who flourished in Italy between 1855 and 1875, and who preceded the realistic novelists, whom again he is hardly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

just to. I could have wished also that in his chapter on humor in art, he could have found it in his conscience or his modesty to touch upon the rise and spread of comic Italian journalism, in which I am sure he would have found matter to convince him that he was underestimating Italian humor. This humor, in its comic journalistic avatar, is too apt to form itself upon the French humor, which in motive is apt to be so nasty, in every sense, so mean, so cynical, so salacious. It is for the most part a putrescent shimmer around the ruins of the seventh commandment, but I doubt if it is the true expression of Italian humor. I doubt for that matter if it is the true expression of French humor, but think it rather the ready convention of the humorists, just as with us a bleak and hardy pessimism concerning marriage for money and the broken engagements of summer girls is the refuge of our hard-pushed cartoonists. At any rate, from a very casual and cursory knowledge of the comic Italian journals I have the sense of something sweeter, which I fancy also more native. I remember from long ago the amusing and altogether inoffensive dismay of the lady who finds herself growing stout just at the moment she has met her fate, and who regards herself in the pitiless mirror with a gesture of despair, and the wild cry, "O, ingrassare adesso!" I remember yet another bit of like innocent humor: the hard lot of the man, on duty during some civic disturbance, who sees pass him the girl he has been looking for so long, and whom he recognizes with the wail of anguish, "Ritrovarla adesso che son proprio qua in sentinella!"

Very likely there were others, which I have forgotten, and I choose to believe that Signor Bellezza could have made an indefinitely better showing for his country in the article of humor if he had suffered himself to regard it without his prepossessions in favor of England and of the Gothic countries generally, of which our own is one, largely if tardily. It is taking up his argument quite at its close to note that he holds England to be the classic home of humor, but he does not fail to extend the honor to the whole English-speaking race. He could not, of course, get in all the American humorists, for he was not writing an encyclopædia, but he gets in eight (some rather by the hair of their heads), and our greatest humorist of all is mentioned and cited more times than any other humorist in the world except Dickens. In fact, without Mr. Clemens, whom it is not necessarily amusing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to find always spoken of as Il Twain (Signor Bellezza tells us that his real name is Samuele Langhorne), the book would be far less rich than it is in the humor which the author draws so preferably from the Gothic sources. Without him, certainly the preponderance would not be so heavy against the Latin races. Nevertheless, Signor Bellezza is right in assigning the humoristic primacy to the Gothic peoples, for the very obvious reason that the South loves the Beautiful, and the North loves the Grotesque. The grotesque is apparently painful rather than delightful to the man of Hellenic or Italic origin. In the one matter, to allege no other, of the foreigner's blundering in his language, he proves this. It is evidently anguish to him, and not that gross delight with which we witness an alien's struggles with our tongue, venting itself in half-stifled snortings of laughter, comparable to nothing but the rapture of boys at the suffering of a companion who has burnt his fingers, or is caught among wasps, or has developed a latent nail in a sliding-place.

Gothic architecture has its well-known moods, when it testifies to this essential difference between the Northern and Southern races, and parades a pig in a monk's cowl among the gracious traceries of fruit and flower beside a cathedral door. But I am afraid Signor Bellezza goes too far in denying all humor to antiquity, which is Southern, and conversely assigning it altogether to modernity, which is Northern. The "Battle of the Frogs and Mice" is not a bad piece of humor; there is fun in Aristophanes of a bitter flavor; Diogenes said rather a humorous thing when he answered Alexander that he could do nothing so much for him as stand out of his light; and certainly the practice of the Socratic method, as the sage himself applied it for the confusion of his fellow citizens, must have provoked at least dry grins from the bystander, who saw the victim entangling himself in the meshes of the inexorable question. We may be sure that it was the irony of this method which brought Socrates to his sad end, and that he came to drink the hemlock because he had often pressed the bitter draught of his wit to the lips of the most respectable Athenians, who publicly suffered from the general sense of humor in an appreciative community.

II.

To come abruptly back to his own people, I wish to say again that Signor Bellezza hardly does them justice. If we are not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

allowed to regard "The Prince" as a piece of grim drolling, from first to last, there are moments in it when we can hardly deny the irony of Machiavelli. Aretino is supposed unmentionable, but in his savage and indecent sort he was unquestionably a humorist, and I cannot believe that there was ever any one who saw life more humorously than Goldoni. As he reported it in his own personal experience, it was most amusing; and Alfieri himself saw his own extravagances with the eye of the satirist.

But it is most with the Spaniards that Signor Bellezza fails to make out his case against the South. If we begin with Cervantes in Don Quixote, and come down with Quevedo and Hurtado de Mendoza in their picaresque tales, to such immediate moderns as Perez Galdós and Armando Palacio Valdés, we have an unsurpassed series of humorists; unsurpassed even in the classic home of humor itself. Señor Valdés alone is sufficient to relieve his nation and epoch from the reproach of sterility in this sort, and the people who let us load ourselves up with the Philippines at a cost of twenty million dollars must have been convulsed with laughter to see us re-establishing slavery within our limits and draping a Mahometan prince in the tatters of our constitution. This, of course, is only plausible conjecture, but it is hard not to believe it actual fact when one reads such humorous studies of manners, such keen criticisms of social life, as *Leon Roch*, or *Carlos IV.*, or *El Cuarto Poder*, or *Riverito*, or *La Hermana de San Sulpizio*, or *La Alegria del Capitan Ribot*.

III.

It is a comfort not to have Signor Bellezza distinguish, or try to distinguish, between wit and humor. He forbears, possibly, because there are no two words in Italian quite answering to these. In any case, his forbearance saves him and us from anything like a disquisition on the difference between French wit and English humor. He seems to take it for granted that the French have humor essentially the same as the English, and though he does not allege any overwhelming number of instances in proof, those he gives are very good. He gives even out of so dark a tragedy as Flaubert's *Madame Bovary* instances which I had never noted or had forgotten, but which one would say were certainly English if he had not found them there. The poor fellow who has lost his club foot through her husband's malpractice comes to her funeral in a new wooden leg to show her respect,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and a peasant who has walked to the burial in a fresh blouse, arrives with his weeping face all blue from rubbing it full of the dye from his sleeves.

This is almost as grisly drolling as the gallows-humor which our author finds chiefly among the Germans, who invented the name for it, *Galgenhumor,* if not the thing itself. They may only have made it their own, and naturalized it among them, after it spread to them from England, like the romantic movement. This supposition might base itself upon Heine's saying that the Arabs have a thousand names for a horse, the Germans for drinking, and the English for hanging; and find support in the fact that it has had no greater development outside of Germany than among the English-speaking race in our own country. It has, as it were, come home to us, and with all the kindred brood of jokes about murders, funerals, suicides, accidents, and the like, flourishes more abundantly here than anywhere else in the world.

Signor Bellezza draws largely upon our gallows-humor, but not so largely quite upon the German. The chief source of his humorous instances in that nation are rightly taken from Heinrich Heine, who, for altogether different reasons and qualities, must stand with Shakespeare and Mark Twain foremost among the humorists of the world. Even if one adds Cervantes and Rabelais to the group, Heine is still supreme, for what John Fiske called a shimmer of emotion—humorous emotion; and he has no second except, perhaps, in Sterne, who was also his first. That is, he derived from Sterne, in the same measure that Tourguénief derived from Pushkin, and with the same effect of making you feel that his master had imitated him.

IV.

I have a feeling that Signor Bellezza might with advantage have dwelt more, among the Russians, on the great Russian I have named, but he satisfies himself with recognizing chiefly the immense humorousness of Gogol, whose *Dead Souls* is one of the vastest schemes in that sort in all literature. In fact, outside of *Don Quixote* it would be hard to parallel it. The resistless comicality, interwoven with the despairing pathos, is strictly Northern, however, and there is a sort of moral squalor in the motive wholly alien to the high satiric intention of the Spaniard. It is a civilization which Gogol satirizes, and it was the mood of a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civilization at which Cervantes mocked, though not with greater lightness. Pushkin's short stories (all I know of his work) show him the worthy father of the delicate scorn which plays through the realism of Tourguénief, and which in such books as *Smoke*, as *Fathers and Sons*, as *The Nest of Nobles*, as *Dimitri Roudine*, becomes at times an anguish of pathos. I do not now recall any phases of Dostoyevsky that could be called humorous, but it would be judging Tolstoy very narrowly not to count him among the great humorists. His sarcasm is, of course, terrible, and we cannot distinguish between sarcasm and humor, or relegate it to the region of wit, if that is anywhere apart; but he has moments of pure humor which are of unsurpassed quality. One of these occurs in that wonderful story of *Polikushka* where two poor muzhiks are watching with a dead body. They have just come from the barnyard; they know that they smell offensively, and they try, at the approach of a respectable person, to make themselves as small as possible. In *War and Peace* is an abundant play of humor in the treatment of several characters, notably that arch humbug, Prince Basil, and the eccentric old father of Prince André, and Pierre, the hero himself. There is nothing more harrowingly and humiliatingly amusing than the scene where, when Prince Basil's daughter Helen has failed to bring Besoukhow to an offer of marriage, the old prince rushes in, after she leaves the room, and flings his arms around Pierre's neck, and accepts him for his son-in-law. He knows very well that there has been no lovemaking, but he compels a marriage between Helen and Pierre by sheer force of his assumption that the young people are engaged. Pierre's part in the battle of Borodino, in spite of the tragic staging, is a comedy part. The father and mother of the divine Natasha, divinely girlish and sincere, are a comedy father and mother, and Natasha herself is humorously as well as beautifully imagined. The flight of young Rostoff before the French, with all that play of terror and self-pity in his mind, and of astonishment that the Frenchmen should wish to kill such a kind, good person as himself, is alive with a humor which is peculiarly Tolstoyan, and is quite unlike the ordinary humor of literature in being exactly like the humor of life. The ferocious reprobate and reckless blackguard (I forget his name), whom Pierre shoots by a kind of accident in a strictly comedy duel, is a personality conceived in a spirit of unspairing yet conscientious humor, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the self-satisfaction of those two bores, Vera Rostoff and her husband Berg, and their entire content with each other, is as veraciously as it is freshly humorous.

As for Anna Karenina, there never was a more comical creature than her worthless brother, whom we find at the opening of the book in the ruins of the home he has wrecked, vainly trying to make as if nothing had happened. Anna's husband, though he has such a tragical part to bear, bears it without dignity, and is at times entirely ridiculous. The book throngs with ghastly shapes of sin and shame, and pietism and hypocrisy, conceived as humorously as the figures in the *Dance of Death*. The soul when it goes naked in its selfishness is always actually or potentially absurd and the soul always goes naked in Tolstoy's page, though the personality is clothed on with the usual fashions, moral and material. For this reason, *The Cossacks*, where the soul of the hero has never anything on to keep us from knowing him, is one of the most humorous books in literature. Even *The Death of Ivan Ilyitch* is a tragedy luminous with the pitiless light of a humor that shows everything. Everywhere the humor of Tolstoy is of the same quality, and is of the absolute sincerity of nature. It is never arranged or posed, but has the currency, the fluidity of the emotions, which he, more than any man who ever lived, knows how to reveal; I was going to say betray, but they betray themselves. Beside him all other humorists have something factitious, contrived, premeditated; he has simply the sad fidelity of a knowledge of humanity that is the nearest like omniscience, and that is incapable of the poor insincerity of the literary poseurs; all other writers seem literary poseurs in his presence.

V.

Signor Bellezza cites but a single example of Tolstoy's humor, and that not one of his best, in his chapter on the humor which contrasts men and brutes, and finds men inferior, or, at least, less respectable. "Tolstoy goes farther: in his *Story of a Horse* he institutes a parallel between the horse that passes his whole life toiling submissively and usefully, and his master, who is rich, selfish, dishonest, and helps nobody. They both die: the flesh of the horse furnishes food for the dogs and crows; even his bones serve to make buttons; the carcase of his master is good for nothing." I am rather glad to have had this example offered

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to my hand, for I should instance it as an effect of that didacticism in Tolstoy which has the least of his inspiration. One touch of his characterization of men, as they show comic even in mortal stresses, such as the reader will find in *The Scenes of the Siege of Sebastopol,* is worth all the grim morals that he labors out of his apologues.

So far as I have noted, Signor Bellezza finds nothing to his purpose in the modern Scandinavian authors, though, without going to the Danes for the whimsical poetic humor of Hans Christian Andersen, the Norwegians, at least, are abundantly humorous. The little tales of Kielland are masterpieces of irony in their social implications, and there is delightful humor in Björnson, though not in all his books. *Magnhild* is a humorous conception of the subtlest and deepest sort; and for the presentation of a histrionic character upon nature's own terms, I know nothing better than his work in evolving the heroine of *The Fishermaiden,* which has deliciously comic situations. None of his plays are without the tricksy light of irony, which is in Ibsen a steady flame that scorches. In a way it may be said that Ibsen's whole view of life is ironical. Think of *Ghosts,* and *The Pillars of Society,* and *The Enemy of the People,* and the irony glares at you through the very names. In *The Wild Duck* and *The Doll House* and *Little Eyolf* it is as pitiless of the witness as of the actors; one must humble one's self for one's own peace' sake before the spectacle of human absurdity which includes one's self. But, above all, *Ghosts* is supremely humorous, though in such a ghastly, tragic sort that one does not easily laugh. When I remember this, I wonder at myself for not having grouped Ibsen with my other greatest humorists, scarcely below the level of Tolstoy. He is really below him less in a humorous vision of life than in the expression of it upon the more mechanical conditions of the drama, which is his form while the epic is Tolstoy's.

VI.

I am not versed in the modern literature of Portgual, and I am not able to say that it is not the most humorous in Europe; I should say the Hungarian would willingly be so if Jokai had his way with himself. He seems to me, in what I have read of him, rather ineffectively fantastic than actually humorous. There were humorous opportunities, rather than humorous achievements in Sinkiewicz's *Sons of the Soil,* which is the only one of his novels

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of modern life that I know. In his prevalently historical fiction he must be too much engrossed in purveying catastrophes for his reader, to have time for amusing him and instructing him through the study of mankind; but I am not, therefore, denying a large humorous literature to the Poles; it may be as great, for all I know, as the Portuguese itself. The Polish Jews, if we may speak from some few developments of Yiddish literature among ourselves, are not without a sense of one another's drollness; perhaps it is the novel light of the new world which has revealed them to themselves. The Russian Jews, in Mr. Abraham Cahan, at least, have come to a humorous consciousness here which is of a charming sort, whatever it may be at home. I should instance this writer as one whose vision of life, never ignoring its pathos, was purely humorous. It is the more humorous because it is so pathetic, if I may be forgiven the commonplace. His *Jekl* is without rival in its kind here, though in Russia the work of the Jews may be rich in *Jekls*. I should not be surprised if it were, for the Jews are rather prolific of humorists everywhere. Not to recur to Heine, who is Olympian for looking down on the ridiculous spectacle that we, including himself, present to the high gods in the bird's-eye view they have of us, there is, for example, the archironical Disraeli, who was able to travesty English life in novels of such fantastic impossibility that their audacious personality was lost in it, and who in statecraft was able to beguile a great people into an imperialistic self-satisfaction so destitute of humor that he could wink the other eye in Jovian amusement at the success of his malign achievement, without awakening suspicion of his seriousness.

W. D. Howells.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED